

**SUMMARY REPORT OF INVESTIGATION<sup>1</sup>****I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Date of Incident:	July 13, 2017
Time of Incident:	6:45 P.M.
Location of Incident:	Near [REDACTED]
Date of COPA Notification:	July 14, 2017
Time of COPA Notification:	2:19 P.M.

On July 13, 2017, complainant [REDACTED] was walking on the [REDACTED] when he was stopped by Chicago Police Department members Marcos Hernandez and Andrew David. [REDACTED] alleged that the officers stopped him, handcuffed him, and searched him without just cause, and [REDACTED] also alleged that he was verbally abused by the officers during the stop. [REDACTED] was not arrested and was not cited for any violation, and he was released by the officers after a short time. [REDACTED] asked the officers who stopped him to summon a supervisor, and [REDACTED] walked to the CPD 10<sup>th</sup> District station to file a complaint when a supervisor did not appear on scene. [REDACTED] alleged that the desk sergeant at the station, Sgt. Thelma Vega, refused to take his complaint. [REDACTED] also alleged that a male sergeant, later identified as Sgt. Richard Salvador, ordered [REDACTED] to stop using his cell phone to video-record the events taking place in the lobby of the station and threatened to arrest [REDACTED] if he did not stop recording. COPA's investigation determined that Officers Hernandez and David had probable cause to stop [REDACTED] based on observing [REDACTED] walking in the roadway, that the officers were justified in briefly handcuffing [REDACTED] and conducting a limited search for weapons based on [REDACTED] observed actions and behavior, and that the amount of force used when handcuffing [REDACTED] was reasonable. COPA's investigation also determined that Sgt. Vega properly attempted to take [REDACTED] complaint, but that [REDACTED] left the police station before Sgt. Vega could take the complaint because Sgt. Salvador improperly ordered [REDACTED] to stop video-recording the encounter and told [REDACTED] that he would have to leave the station if he did not stop recording.

**II. INVOLVED PARTIES**

Involved Officer #1:	<b>Police Officer Marcos Hernandez</b> ; Star #7917; Employee ID # [REDACTED]; Appointed on [REDACTED] 2014; Unit # [REDACTED] DOB [REDACTED] 1984; Male, White Hispanic
Involved Officer #2:	<b>Police Officer Andrew David</b> ; Star #16316; Employee ID# [REDACTED]; Appointed on [REDACTED] 2013; DOB [REDACTED] 1988; Male; White Hispanic

<sup>1</sup> On September 15, 2017, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) replaced the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) as the civilian oversight agency of the Chicago Police Department. Therefore, this investigation, which began under IPRA, was transferred to COPA on September 15, 2017, and the recommendation(s) set forth herein are the recommendation(s) of COPA.

### Involved Officer #3

**Sergeant of Police Thelma Vega; Star #1181; Employee ID# [REDACTED]; Appointed on [REDACTED] 2005; Seniority Date [REDACTED] 2017; DOB [REDACTED] 1981; Female; White Hispanic**

#### Involved Officer #4

**Sergeant of Police Richard Salvador; Star #964;**  
Employee ID # [REDACTED] Appointed on [REDACTED] 2004;  
Seniority Date [REDACTED] 2017; DOB [REDACTED] 1981; Male;  
Asian/Pacific Islander

Subject #1:

DOB [REDACTED] 1992; Male; Black

### III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer	Allegation	Finding
Police Officer Marcos Hernandez	It is alleged that on July 13, 2017, at approximately 1845 hours, near [REDACTED] that Police Officer Marcos Hernandez:	
	1. Used excessive force in stopping, seizing, and searching [REDACTED] in violation of Rules 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, and 10, and;	Unfounded
	2. Seized [REDACTED] without reasonable grounds to believe that [REDACTED] was committing, was about to commit, or had committed a crime, in violation of Rules 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 10, and 11, and;	Unfounded
	3. Handcuffed [REDACTED] without reasonable grounds to believe that handcuffing [REDACTED] was necessary to preserve his own safety or Police Officer Andrew David's safety, in violation of Rules 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, and 10, and;	Unfounded
	4. Frisked [REDACTED] without reasonable grounds to believe that [REDACTED] was armed and dangerous, in violation of Rules 1, 2, 3, 6, 10, and 11, and;	Unfounded
	5. Searched [REDACTED] tote bag without reasonable grounds to believe the bag contained a weapon, in violation of Rules 1, 2, 3, 8, 10, and 11, and;	Unfounded

	<p>6. Handcuffed [REDACTED] more tightly than reasonably necessary, in violation of Rules 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, and 10, and;</p> <p>7. Verbally maltreated [REDACTED] by saying words to the effect of "I don't fuckin' care what you heard, man. I don't work for you," in response to [REDACTED] inquiry about a police supervisor responding to the scene of the stop, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 8, and 9, and;</p> <p>8. Did not document stopping [REDACTED] by completing an Investigatory Stop Report, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 10, and 11, and;</p> <p>9. Verbally maltreated [REDACTED] by saying words to the effect of "Good luck with two Hispanic officers, idiot," in response to [REDACTED] saying that he planned to report Officer David and Officer Hernandez for racial discrimination, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 8, and 9.</p>	Unfounded
Police Officer Andrew David	<p>It is alleged that on July 13, 2017, at approximately 1845 hours, near [REDACTED] that Police Officer Andrew David:</p> <p>1. Used excessive force in stopping, seizing, and searching [REDACTED] in violation of Rules 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, and 10, and;</p> <p>2. Seized [REDACTED] without reasonable grounds to believe that [REDACTED] was committing, was about to commit, or had committed a crime, in violation of Rules 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 10, and 11, and;</p> <p>3. Verbally maltreated [REDACTED] by saying words to the effect of "Good luck with two Hispanic officers, idiot," in response to [REDACTED] saying that he planned to report Officer David and Officer Hernandez for racial discrimination, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 8, and 9, and;</p> <p>4. Did not document stopping [REDACTED] by completing an Investigatory Stop Report, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 10, and 11.</p>	<p>Sustained</p> <p>Exonerated</p> <p>Sustained</p>

Sergeant of Police Thelma Vega	<p>It is alleged that on July 13, 2017, at approximately 1900 hours, at the Chicago Police Department 10<sup>th</sup> District, 3315 West Ogden Avenue, that Sgt. Thelma Vega:</p> <p>1. Did not initiate an investigation of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] complaint regarding the conduct of Officer Hernandez and Officer David as required by General Order G08-01-02, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, and 10.</p>	Exonerated
Sergeant of Police Richard Salvador	<p>It is alleged that on July 13, 2017, at approximately 7:30 P.M&gt;, at 3315 West Ogden Avenue, that Sgt. Richard Salvador:</p> <p>1. Hindered or prevented [REDACTED] from recording a law enforcement officer who was performing his or her duties in a public place by ordering [REDACTED] to turn off his cellular telephone while [REDACTED] was recording officers in the lobby of the CPD District 010 station.</p>	Sustained

#### IV. APPLICABLE RULES AND LAWS

##### Rules

###### 1. Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department<sup>2,3</sup>

Article V, Rules of Conduct, of the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department includes the following prohibitions:

Rule 1: Violation of any law or ordinance.

Rule 2: Any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department.

Rule 3: Any failure to promote the Department's efforts to implement its policy or accomplish its goals.

Rule 6: Disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral.

Rule 8: Disrespect to or maltreatment of any person, while on or off duty.

<sup>2</sup> The version of the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department referenced in this summary report was adopted on April 16, 2015. These Rules were in effect at the time of the incident under investigation.

<sup>3</sup> Additional relevant excerpts from the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department are presented in Appendix B of this report.

---

Rule 9: Engaging in any unjustified verbal or physical altercation with any person, while on or off duty.

Rule 10: Inattention to duty.

Rule 11: Incompetency or inefficiency in the performance of duty.

---

General Orders

---

**1. General Order G03-02,<sup>4</sup> Use of Force Guidelines**

---

**2. General Order G03-02-02,<sup>5</sup> Force Options**

---

Special Orders

---

**1. Special Order S03-14,<sup>6</sup> Body Worn Cameras**

---

Federal Laws

---

**1. Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution**

---

State Laws

---

**1. Illinois Constitution, Section 6. Searches, Seizures, Privacy and Interceptions**

---

**2. 50 ILCS 706/10-20(a)(11)**

**3. 625 ILCS 5/11-1007(a)**

**4. 725 ILCS 5/107-2(1)(c)**

**5. 725 ILCS 5/107-14**

**6. 725 ILCS 5/108-1.01**

---

City Ordinances

---

**1. Chi., Ill., Municipal Code § 2-84-230 (1990)**

---

**2. Chi., Ill., Municipal Code § 2-84-310 (1990)**

---

<sup>4</sup> This order was issued on September 23, 2002, became effective on October 1, 2002, and was rescinded on October 16, 2017. This order was in effect at the time of the incident under investigation.

<sup>5</sup> This order was issued on January 1, 2016 and was rescinded on October 16, 2017. This order was in effect at the time of the incident under investigation.

<sup>6</sup> This order was issued, and became effective, on June 9, 2017, and was in effect at the time of the incident under investigation.

3. Chi., Ill., Municipal Code § 2-84-320 (1990)

4. Chi., Ill., Municipal Code § 8-4-125 (2004)

5. Chi., Ill., Municipal Code § 9-80-180 (1990)

## V. INVESTIGATION<sup>7</sup>

### a. Interviews

#### 1. Statement of Complainant [REDACTED]<sup>8</sup>

[REDACTED] was interviewed by IPRA on July 14, 2017. [REDACTED] said that on Thursday, July 13, 2017, at about 6:45 p.m., he walked out of his residence at [REDACTED] [REDACTED].<sup>9</sup> [REDACTED] exited through the rear door and walked down to the alley on the west side of the building, and he then walked south in the alley out to the sidewalk on 21<sup>st</sup> Street. [REDACTED] saw an unmarked, gray Ford Explorer driving on 21<sup>st</sup> Street. The Explorer made a U-turn and then stopped in the middle of the street near the entrance to the alley. [REDACTED] said that the license plate on the Explorer was MP11880, and that he later identified the occupants of the vehicle as CPD officers Hernandez, badge number 7912,<sup>10</sup> and David, badge number 1631.<sup>11</sup> PO David was the driver and PO Hernandez was the passenger. Both officers were wearing civilian clothing, but they were wearing vests showing their names and badge numbers.

[REDACTED] said that PO Hernandez exited the Explorer and said, “Don’t run.” [REDACTED] immediately put his hands up and said, “Have I committed any crime? Did you guys receive a phone call that I committed a crime or do I fit the description of a suspect who committed a crime?” PO Hernandez replied “no,” and [REDACTED] asked, “Am I free to go?” PO Hernandez replied, “No.” [REDACTED] asked again if he was suspected of any criminal activity, and both officers again said “no.” [REDACTED] said that he kept his hands in the air as both officers approached him. [REDACTED] said that he told the officers “I do not give you guys permission to search me or my personal belongings.”

[REDACTED] recounted that PO Hernandez then grabbed [REDACTED] by the right arm and slammed him up against a gate to an adjacent fenced yard.<sup>12</sup> [REDACTED] chest was pressed against the fence, which [REDACTED] described as a chain-link fence, about six feet in height. [REDACTED] said that he was slammed

<sup>7</sup> COPA conducted a thorough and complete investigation. The following is a summary of the material evidence gathered and relied upon in our analysis.

<sup>8</sup> Attachments 7, 79.

<sup>9</sup> IPRA conducted a canvass of the area where the incident occurred and attempted to contact possible witnesses who were identified by [REDACTED]. No material evidence or information was discovered. (Attachments 21, 22, 23, 25, 87)

<sup>10</sup> As noted above, PO Hernandez’s correct star number is #7917.

<sup>11</sup> As noted above, PO David’s correct star number is #16316.

<sup>12</sup> Later in the interview, [REDACTED] said that PO Hernandez had grabbed him by the right wrist with a “gorilla grip” before twisting [REDACTED] arm behind his back and pushing him against the gate. [REDACTED] also recalled that PO Hernandez had pushed [REDACTED] on the chest prior to grabbing his wrist. When PO Hernandez pushed [REDACTED] raised his hands and told PO Hernandez that he was not trying to fight and was not resisting arrest.

“hard enough to rattle the gate.” PO Hernandez placed his knee between [REDACTED] legs and handcuffed [REDACTED] tightly behind [REDACTED] back. [REDACTED] said that he did not have any visible injuries to his wrists, but that there were indentations on his wrists immediately after the handcuffs were removed, and his wrists had temporarily turned a bluish or purplish color. [REDACTED] said that he did not photograph his wrists.

[REDACTED] saw that PO Hernandez was equipped with a body-worn camera, and [REDACTED] asked PO Hernandez if the camera was on. PO Hernandez then pressed a button and said that the camera was on.<sup>13</sup> PO Hernandez then told [REDACTED] that the officers would run [REDACTED] name and let him go if he returned clear. [REDACTED] told PO Hernandez that the officers were inconveniencing him and that he did not give them permission to conduct a search. PO Hernandez replied that [REDACTED] could not tell the police what to do, and PO Hernandez frisked [REDACTED] clothing, placed his hands inside [REDACTED] pockets, and searched inside [REDACTED] barber bag. [REDACTED] told the officers that he intended to file a complaint, and [REDACTED] asked the officers to call for a supervisor. [REDACTED] said that he requested a supervisor multiple times, but the officers kept laughing at him in response. [REDACTED] started yelling out for assistance and requested that anyone in the area record the incident on their camera-phone. In response to [REDACTED] cries for help, a teenage boy who was in the area pulled out his phone and appeared to begin recording. [REDACTED] said that he does not know the boy’s name, but he has seen the boy in the neighborhood on previous occasions.

The officers asked [REDACTED] for identification, and [REDACTED] told them that his identification was in the back of his cell-phone case. [REDACTED] then asked PO David if PO David’s body-worn camera was turned on, and PO David replied “yes.” PO David took [REDACTED] identification back to the Explorer, and [REDACTED] again asked if he was free to go. [REDACTED] also asked the officers if they were harassing him because of his race. In response to the question about race, both officers looked at each other and began laughing. PO David returned with [REDACTED] identification and told [REDACTED] that if he didn’t shut up, he’d be going to jail.

Eventually, the officers released [REDACTED] from the handcuffs and told [REDACTED] that he was free to go; [REDACTED] took out his cell-phone and began to video-record the incident.<sup>14</sup> [REDACTED] attempted to record the officers’ badge numbers and the license plate number on their vehicle. [REDACTED] also asked both officers for their names and badge numbers, and the officers provided this information. While [REDACTED] stood outside the driver-side door of the patrol vehicle, PO David told [REDACTED] that the officers could lock [REDACTED] up for obstructing traffic. [REDACTED] then walked out of the street and stood on the sidewalk. [REDACTED] continued to ask for a “white shirt” supervisor, and the officers drove away, telling [REDACTED] to wait for the supervisor. When no supervisor arrived, [REDACTED] walked to the CPD’s 10<sup>th</sup> District Station at 3315 West Ogden Avenue, arriving sometime after 7:00 p.m.

[REDACTED] walked into the lobby of the police station and asked to file a complaint. The first officer that [REDACTED] encountered told [REDACTED] that he didn’t have any paper, and [REDACTED] then asked to speak with a sergeant. [REDACTED] spoke with Sgt. Vega, badge number 1181, who [REDACTED] described as female, short, and Hispanic. [REDACTED] told Sgt. Vega about his encounter with Officers Hernandez

<sup>13</sup> When asked if the red lights were flashing on either officers’ body camera, [REDACTED] answered that he did not see any blinking lights.

<sup>14</sup> [REDACTED] provided COPA with a copy of his cell-phone video recording. The recording is discussed below. (Attachment 8)

and David, and said that he wanted to file a complaint for assault, harassment, and “threats of being incarcerated for just walking down the street and being my skin color in my own neighborhood.” [REDACTED] also told Sgt. Vega that he had the names and badge numbers of the officers and that he had a video recording. [REDACTED] gave Sgt. Vega a piece of paper with the officers’ names and badge numbers written down, and Sgt. Vega took the paper to a computer terminal. Sgt. Vega then returned to [REDACTED] and told [REDACTED] that CPD had no officers with those names or with those badge numbers. [REDACTED] told Sgt. Vega that he saw “District 010” and “Ogden” on the officers’ name tapes, and he was sure that they were from Sgt. Vega’s district. Sgt. Vega replied, “Sorry, I cannot help you.” [REDACTED] told Sgt. Vega that he also had the license plate number from the officers’ vehicle, and Sgt. Vega replied that she might be able to help. [REDACTED] told Sgt. Vega that the license plate number was recorded on his cell phone, but the battery on the phone had died. [REDACTED] told Sgt. Vega that he would walk home and charge the phone, and he would return to the police station later.

[REDACTED] went home, charged his phone, and obtained the license plate number of the patrol vehicle. He then walked back to the 10<sup>th</sup> District station and approached the front desk. The desk officer spoke with [REDACTED] about his complaint and told him to wait for a sergeant. [REDACTED] said that he was broadcasting on Facebook Live with his cell phone to record the fact that he was attempting to file the complaint. The desk officer walked to the other end of the service counter and spoke with Sgt. Vega, who was working at a computer terminal. Sgt. Vega then spoke with [REDACTED] and asked [REDACTED] to wait. [REDACTED] sat down in the lobby and continued to broadcast on Facebook Live with his phone. A male CPD sergeant then approached [REDACTED] and yelled for [REDACTED] to turn off his phone, telling [REDACTED] that he could not have his cell-phone out in the police station. [REDACTED] described the male sergeant as Caucasian, possibly of Hispanic descent, between 5’7” and 5’9” in height, between 180 and 215 lbs., with gray hair. While this was happening, another civilian sitting next to [REDACTED] also appeared to be using her cell phone, but the sergeant did not say anything to that person. In response to the male sergeant’s command, [REDACTED] put his phone in his pocket, but he continued to broadcast on Facebook Live until his battery ran out.

About 15 minutes after his encounter with the male sergeant, Sgt. Vega told [REDACTED] that he would have to continue to wait if he wanted to file a complaint. Sgt. Vega also gave [REDACTED] the telephone number for IPRA, and she told [REDACTED] that he could call that number to file his complaint. [REDACTED] told Sgt. Vega that he had “all of the time in the world” and that he would wait for her. [REDACTED] also told Sgt. Vega that he wanted to file a complaint against her for refusing to take his complaint against POs Hernandez and David. While [REDACTED] continued to wait, he spoke with his step-father by telephone. [REDACTED] step-father advised [REDACTED] to leave the police station before the police became angry, and [REDACTED] fearing what the police might do, walked out of the station. He walked home, arriving just after 9:00 p.m. He filed his complaint at IPRA the following day.

## 2. Statement of Accused Police Officer Andrew David<sup>15</sup>

COPA interviewed PO David on November 13, 2017. PO David said that on July 13, 2017, he was working evenings on Beat 1061D, a tactical team, with his partner, PO Hernandez. At about 6:45 p.m., they were on patrol near 3434 West 21<sup>st</sup> Street when they observed a subject, later identified as [REDACTED], walking “literally in the middle of the street,” causing vehicles to

<sup>15</sup> Attachments 56, 57, 82, 83.

change course to avoid striking him. PO David said that [REDACTED] obstruction of traffic was the only reason for [REDACTED] stop. When the officers approached [REDACTED] he walked back towards the sidewalk. As PO David, who was driving, stopped and parked their patrol vehicle, PO Hernandez exited and approached [REDACTED] who at that point had reached the grassy area between the street and the sidewalk. As PO Hernandez approached, [REDACTED] immediately became irate, "tightened up," and pulled away from PO Hernandez as PO Hernandez attempted to grab him. PO David exited the vehicle and assisted his partner in patting down [REDACTED] and placing [REDACTED] in handcuffs. PO David said that he used "barely any" force while handcuffing [REDACTED] simply placing his hand against [REDACTED] lower back and holding [REDACTED] arm as PO Hernandez applied the handcuffs.

The officers attempted to explain the reason for the stop to [REDACTED] but [REDACTED] argued with them and complained that he had been stopped unjustly. [REDACTED] complained that the handcuffs were too tight, and PO David immediately checked and loosened the cuffs. PO David believed that [REDACTED] discomfort was relieved because [REDACTED] stopped complaining about the tightness of the handcuffs. PO David recalled patting down [REDACTED] pockets and waistband, but he did not search [REDACTED] bag or inside [REDACTED] clothing.<sup>16</sup> PO David saw PO Hernandez look inside of a bag that [REDACTED] had dropped when PO Hernandez initially approached [REDACTED]. PO David explained that the officers conducted the pat-down because [REDACTED] was screaming and pulling away from PO Hernandez, leading PO David to believe that [REDACTED] might assault the officers. Because PO David believed [REDACTED] might assault the officers, PO David wanted to make sure that [REDACTED] was not armed; the purpose of the pat-down was only to discover if [REDACTED] possessed any weapons. The officers did not find any weapons. PO David then obtained [REDACTED] identification and checked [REDACTED] name through LEADS. When [REDACTED] name-check returned clear, the officers released [REDACTED]. PO David explained that the officers chose not to issue any tickets or pursue any charges because they didn't know if [REDACTED] was "physically and mentally stable" or if he was just having a "bad day."

PO David said that he had intended to provide [REDACTED] with an ISR receipt, but that he had run out of the receipts. PO David returned to the patrol vehicle to find a receipt, but there were no receipts in the vehicle. At that point, [REDACTED] asked to speak with a sergeant, and the officers contacted their supervisor, Sergeant Onesto. The officers returned to their patrol vehicle, and [REDACTED] walked into the street and began speaking to PO David through the driver-side window. PO David had de-activated his body-worn camera when he believed the encounter with [REDACTED] was over, but he re-activated the camera when [REDACTED] approached their vehicle. The officers asked Sgt. Onesto to meet with [REDACTED] and to give [REDACTED] an ISR receipt. The officers told [REDACTED] to wait for the sergeant, and they drove away. PO David later learned from Sgt. Onesto that [REDACTED] was gone when the sergeant arrived.

PO David acknowledged that CPD directives required him to complete an Investigatory Stop Report (ISR) to document [REDACTED] stop. PO David also acknowledged that he did not, in fact, ever complete the ISR. PO David explained, "There was a miscommunication on who was going to do it, and then we . . . forgot to put it in the system later on. A lot of things happened that day – a miscommunication of who was going to do it." PO David believed that the miscommunication happened because PO Hernandez was the "business officer" that day, and the business officer

<sup>16</sup> After viewing PO Hernandez's body-worn camera video recording, PO David said that he now believed he did not pat [REDACTED] down, and he only stood by while PO Hernandez conducted the pat-down.

usually completed the reports. But in the case of [REDACTED] PO David had all of [REDACTED] biographical information, so PO David would have been responsible for completing the report.

COPA investigators and PO David watched body-worn camera video recordings from PO David and PO Hernandez that documented [REDACTED] stop, as well as [REDACTED] cell-phone video recording. After viewing and listening to the recordings, PO David identified PO Hernandez as the person who referred to [REDACTED] as a “fucking clown” and a “fucking idiot.” PO David also identified PO Hernandez as the person who said, “I don’t fucking care what you heard, man” to [REDACTED] and as the person who said, “Good luck with two Hispanic officers, idiot.”

When confronted with the specific allegations in this investigation, PO David denied using excessive force against [REDACTED] denied seizing [REDACTED] without justification, and denied verbally maltreating [REDACTED] PO David admitted that he did not document the stop by completing an ISR.

### 3. Interview of Accused Police Officer Marcos Hernandez<sup>17</sup>

COPA interviewed PO Hernandez on November 20, 2017. PO Hernandez provided an account of [REDACTED] stop that was substantially similar to the account provided by PO David. PO Hernandez recalled that [REDACTED] threw his backpack to the ground, unprompted, as PO Hernandez approached. PO Hernandez believed that this was “extremely suspicious,” as most people do not spontaneously drop their belongings when approached by police. PO Hernandez said that he heard a “clunking sound” when the backpack hit the ground, leading him to believe that a metallic object, possibly a gun or some other type of weapon, was inside the backpack. PO Hernandez opened the backpack and discovered that it contained haircutting equipment. PO Hernandez agreed that an ISR was required to document the stop. When the stop was over, PO Hernandez discussed the ISR with PO David, and PO David acknowledged that he had the information required to complete the report.

COPA investigators and PO Hernandez watched body-worn camera video recordings from PO David and PO Hernandez that documented [REDACTED] stop, as well as [REDACTED] cell-phone video recording. After viewing and listening to the recordings, PO Hernandez said that he did not recall saying, “Good luck with two Hispanic officers, idiot” to [REDACTED] but he did not deny making this statement. PO Hernandez admitted that he said, “I don’t fuckin’ care what you heard, man,” to [REDACTED]. PO Hernandez explained his use of profanity:

A lot of times . . . we’ll start off, hey man, listen, relax . . . most times that works. Oftentimes, if it doesn’t you wanna keep raising your voice and screaming, now I’m gonna start raising my voice and screaming too, because, you’re gonna see that. You’re just not going to continue to trounce and trounce and trounce, start outward like that. Now, it’s rare that it has to get past that.

Sometimes, it has to get there. But, when guys do that, and you see from the beginning, nobody called him a name, nobody cursed him out . . . It was, hey, just relax, just relax, just relax. But, he wouldn’t stop. So no, you have to see, okay,

<sup>17</sup> Attachments 66, 67, 84, 85.

listen, now I'm gonna raise my voice. And then, ... after that, he kept on talking, but it was much calmer. And, that is the tactic. And, it often does work.

PO Hernandez said that he was not taught this tactic at the police academy, but "I was taught that throughout life."

When confronted with the specific allegations in this investigation, PO Hernandez denied using excessive force against [REDACTED] denied seizing [REDACTED] without justification, denied handcuffing [REDACTED] without justification, denied frisking [REDACTED] without justification, denied searching [REDACTED] bag without justification, and denied handcuffing [REDACTED] more tightly than reasonably necessary. PO Hernandez said that he did not recall verbally maltreating [REDACTED] but, "I have no reason to doubt what is depicted in the audio, or video." PO Hernandez admitted that he did not document the stop by completing an ISR, but explained that he did not believe he was responsible for completing the ISR based on the understanding he had with PO David regarding their division of labor.

#### 4. Interview of Accused Sergeant of Police Thelma Vega<sup>18</sup>

COPA interviewed Sgt. Vega on November 14, 2017. Sgt. Vega said that on July 13, 2017, at about 7:00 p.m., she was working, in uniform, in the 10<sup>th</sup> District station as the desk sergeant. Sgt. Vega said that she normally worked in the field as a patrol supervisor, but that she sometimes fills in as the desk sergeant when the personnel normally assigned to that function are on furlough. Sgt. Vega also said that she had been promoted to the rank of sergeant only four months prior her encounter with the subject later identified as [REDACTED] and she had only taken one log number complaint prior to July 13, 2017. Sgt. Vega said that she had a "cheat sheet" that she was given by another sergeant or lieutenant to use when taking complaints, but she would have likely had to leave the desk and retrieve the "cheat sheet" from her locker before taking [REDACTED] complaint.

During her statement to COPA, Sgt. Vega tendered a copy of a document titled "Arrest Report Search Print" for the District 010 Lockup on July 13, 2017.<sup>19</sup> Sgt. Vega explained that the document listed all the people who were arrested in the Tenth District around the time that [REDACTED] came to file his complaint, and she further explained that she had to approve every arrest and review all the associated paperwork. Sgt. Vega also reiterated that she rarely worked as a desk sergeant, that she was trying to be very thorough in her work, and that each arrest took about 15 minutes to process.

Sgt. Vega recalled that [REDACTED] came into the station and asked to file a complaint. She also said that [REDACTED] was "in my face" and that he was holding his phone in her face. Sgt. Vega told [REDACTED] that she had "a line of officers that needed reports approved and inventories for due process," and she asked [REDACTED] to wait. [REDACTED] immediately accused Sgt. Vega of not taking his report, and Sgt. Vega insisted that she would take the report, but that [REDACTED] needed to wait. Sgt. Vega did not provide [REDACTED] an estimate of how long the wait would be, but she believed it would have taken about 30 minutes to complete her more pressing tasks and attend to [REDACTED]. Sgt. Vega also

<sup>18</sup> Attachments 60, 61, 80, 81.

<sup>19</sup> The reports documents that three people were arrested between 7:10 and 7:19 p.m., and a total of six arrests were processed between 7:10 p.m. and 9:12 p.m., after which Sgt. Vega's shift ended. (Attachment 62)

remembered offering IPRA's telephone number to [REDACTED] and she told [REDACTED] that he could file his complaint with IPRA if he did not want to wait.

At some point, [REDACTED] told Sgt. Vega that he wanted to complain about two officers who had stopped him earlier in the day. [REDACTED] handed Sgt. Vega a piece of paper with star numbers written on it, and Sgt. Vega attempted to look up the star numbers in her computer. Neither star number, however, returned as being associated with a current CPD member. Sgt. Vega told [REDACTED] that the star numbers were not correct, and she gave the piece of paper back to [REDACTED]. Sgt. Vega described what happened:

I asked him to wait and I gave him the number to IPRA and I said I needed some time – the whole time when I was approving and hadn't finished what I was doing he was in my face with the phone. It was very frustrating for me to finish what I was doing and tend to his needs just because it felt like a lot of pressure. So I just kept asking him to wait and then I'd give in and okay, let me run this and that's when I ran the star numbers. But then I felt like I wasn't doing everything correctly or I felt like I could make a mistake on the reports or what I was running for him because I wasn't, you know, given time because he kept, you know, insisting in kind of a rude way to be honest.

Sgt. Vega did not remember if [REDACTED] ever left the station and returned. Sgt. Vega did remember that other civilians and other CPD members were in the lobby, and the civilians were there to file police reports. While this was happening, [REDACTED] was holding up his phone and loudly narrating the event, saying, "They don't want to give me a report." Sgt. Vega recalled that Sgt. Richard Salvador was in the lobby, and Sgt. Salvador told [REDACTED] to stop recording because "there were other people in the waiting room waiting to get a report done and [REDACTED] was recording the whole lobby." [REDACTED] became angry when Sgt. Salvador told him he could not record, and Sgt. Salvador told [REDACTED] that he could record the police, but he could not record the other people in the lobby. Sgt. Vega did not recall how the incident ended or if [REDACTED] obeyed Sgt. Salvador's order to stop recording. But at some point, the lobby became quiet, and Sgt. Vega went back to her work. She never saw [REDACTED] again, and she assumed he had walked out of the station.

Sgt. Vega acknowledged that, as a CPD supervisor, she was required to initiate an investigation and to begin the log number report process. Sgt. Vega said that she fully intended to take [REDACTED] complaint and initiate the required procedure, and the only reason she did not take the complaint was that [REDACTED] did not wait. Sgt. Vega said that the initial information she received from [REDACTED] before he left the station was not sufficient for her to initiate an investigation, as she never learned [REDACTED] name, the time or location of the interaction [REDACTED] was complaining about, or any information, other than incorrect star numbers, that could identify the involved CPD members. When confronted with the specific allegation against her, Sgt. Vega responded, "I didn't know who those officers were at the time and I wasn't given the opportunity to take the log because the citizen didn't wait," and, "I would have given him a log number if he would have waited the half hour that I needed him to wait."

**5. Interview of Accused Sergeant of Police Richard Salvador<sup>20</sup>**

COPA interviewed Sgt. Salvador on December 28, 2017. Sgt. Salvador said that on July 13, 2017, at about 7:00 p.m., he was working, in uniform, in the 10<sup>th</sup> District on an overtime assignment supervising officers assigned to the Violence Reduction Initiative (VRI). Sgt. Salvador had been promoted to the rank of sergeant only a few months prior to the date of this incident, and his normal assignment was as a relief supervisor, working on the street in the 10<sup>th</sup> District. Sgt. Salvador recalled walking into the front desk area and seeing the subject later identified as [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] holding his cell phone in the air and pointing the phone towards different areas, as if he was recording. Sgt. Salvador remembered seeing some interaction between [REDACTED] and the desk sergeant, Sgt. Vega, but he did not know any of the details regarding their interaction. Sgt. Salvador confronted [REDACTED] and immediately told [REDACTED] to stop recording. Sgt. Salvador explained:

I don't remember what he said to me; but I knew I asked him to stop recording various times, intermittently, so. I would ask him to stop. He wouldn't stop. Maybe a minute would go by and I would ask him to stop again, and he wouldn't stop. And I told him you can't record inside here; you can record outside if you wish. He didn't stop, so, I basically just told him that he couldn't record various times.

[REDACTED] did not stop recording, and Sgt. Salvador told [REDACTED] that he had to leave the station if he was not going to stop. [REDACTED] then walked out of the station, and Sgt. Salvador never saw him again. Sgt. Salvador did not remember if [REDACTED] ever said that he was there to file a complaint. Even if [REDACTED] had said that he wanted to file a complaint, Sgt. Salvador explained that he still would have told [REDACTED] to stop recording. Sgt. Salvador could not recall if he threatened to arrest [REDACTED] if [REDACTED] did not stop recording.

Sgt. Salvador said that there were multiple reasons why he told [REDACTED] to stop recording:

In this station, it is a public area, but the public is entitled to their privacy, especially when we have rape victims, juveniles who are victims of crimes, domestic battery victims, witnesses; it is a safe haven also. By Illinois State law, it is declared a safe haven.

We also have an ATM machine. When people are being interviewed by other police officers, they have to give very important information, not only their personal information, but details into something that has been traumatic to them. And for that reason, I tell you to stop recording.

There's also a statute . . . which is the use of cell phones, cameras, camera phones in "public privacy areas." And there's a list of areas . . . which I think the most important thing is including, but not limited to and it's a list of places: showers, locker rooms, changing rooms, bathrooms, and automatic teller machine areas, and cashier lines.

In the lobby of the station room, we have an . . . automatic teller machine, which, obviously, if I believe that someone has a privacy in a public area to not be recorded at an ATM machine. I'm pretty sure that I, in my position, and in my

<sup>20</sup> Attachments 78, 86.

experience, I have the knowledge to make the call to say, hey, you can't record because we have rape victims, domestic battery victims, juveniles, children, safe haven.

We have . . . confidential informants . . . walking into the station to meet with police officers who I'm pretty sure do not want their identity compromised through any type of social media whatsoever. That is the reason why I told him to stop recording various times within the station.

Sgt. Salvador acknowledged that he did not know if any of the citizens in the lobby were, in fact, using the ATM or engaged in any of the activities or reporting any of the types of crimes that he had described. Sgt. Salvador also acknowledged that CPD Special Order S03-14 prohibits officers from hindering or preventing people who are recording officers performing their duties in a public place. Sgt. Salvador acknowledged that he was performing his duties, that he was in a public place, and that he had no personal expectation of privacy when he ordered Smith to stop recording. But Sgt. Salvador also acknowledged that the same special order allows CPD members to take reasonable actions to enforce the law and to perform their duties; in this case, Sgt. Salvador believed that ordering Smith to stop recording was reasonable because of the possible presence of crime victims, confidential informants, and other civilians who expected privacy.

When asked about the configuration of the lobby, Sgt. Salvador explained that the ATM is located on the right, just inside of the public entrance. There is a "huge long desk" where reports are taken. Sgt. Salvador further explained that the desk sergeant sits at the opposite end of the lobby from the ATM, and [REDACTED] was near the desk sergeant when Sgt. Salvador confronted him. Sgt. Salvador later clarified that [REDACTED] was pacing back and forth, and Smith may have been closer to the ATM at some point.

When confronted with the specific allegation against him, Sgt. Salvador said, "Unfortunately, I cannot attest to what his intentions were with the recording device. All I know is that from my observation, he appeared to be recording with his cellular phone."

### **b. Digital Evidence**

COPA requested all CPD body-worn camera and in-car camera recordings associated with Beat [REDACTED] PO Andrew David and PO Marcos Hernandez, related to an incident that occurred at 6:45 p.m. on July 13, 2017, around [REDACTED]. The following recordings were turned over to COPA and made part of the investigation.<sup>21</sup>

#### **1. Body-Worn Camera, PO Marcos Hernandez<sup>22</sup>**

One recording from PO Hernandez's body-worn camera was turned over to COPA. The recording begins at 6:51:10 p.m. and is five minutes and twelve seconds long. The first thirty seconds of the recording are silent. The recording starts with PO Hernandez seated in the front

<sup>21</sup> The response from CPD's Records Division indicated that no in-car camera video was recovered. Body-worn camera recordings were recovered for both involved officers. No police observation device (POD) cameras were found in the area. (Attachments 10, 20, 35)

<sup>22</sup> Attachment 37.

passenger seat of a moving vehicle. The vehicle stops, and PO Hernandez opens his door and steps out. [REDACTED] can be seen walking on the grass between the street and the sidewalk on the north side of [REDACTED], heading west, away from the apartment building at [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] As PO Hernandez exits the vehicle and begins moving towards [REDACTED], [REDACTED] stops walking, raises his hands, and steps back onto the sidewalk. [REDACTED] stands facing PO Hernandez with his hands up, palms forward at approximately shoulder-height, with a cell phone in his right hand and a black leather tote bag or backpack in his left hand. A tall chain-link fence is behind [REDACTED] separating the sidewalk from an empty lot. A closed gate in the chain-link fence is directly behind [REDACTED].

As PO Hernandez closes the distance to [REDACTED], [REDACTED] bends forward and his arms begin to lower. [REDACTED] then steps backwards and raises his right arm up and out to his side as PO Hernandez grabs [REDACTED] left forearm with his left hand, bringing [REDACTED] left arm down and in front of his body. PO Hernandez steps to [REDACTED] left side and begins to bring [REDACTED] left arm behind his back. [REDACTED] right arm is still raised, palm forward, holding his phone. [REDACTED] turns and steps back, away from PO Hernandez, so that [REDACTED] is now facing east. PO Hernandez is still holding [REDACTED] left forearm, and [REDACTED] left arm is extended in front of his body. PO Hernandez uses his right hand to turn on his body-worn camera, and the audio recording begins at the 30-second mark.

As the audio begins, [REDACTED] says, "For the record and on the record, I do not give you permission to search me." [REDACTED] backs up towards the chain-link fence, and PO Hernandez tells [REDACTED] to put his hands on the gate. [REDACTED] turns around to face the fence. PO David stands behind [REDACTED] and PO David places his left hand on the left side of [REDACTED] torso while holding [REDACTED] right arm with his right hand. PO Hernandez pats the outside of [REDACTED] pants below the waist and appears to feel for objects in [REDACTED] pockets. [REDACTED] continues to say that he does not give the officers permission to search him, and [REDACTED] asks both officers to provide their names and badge numbers when they finish what they are doing. PO Hernandez takes hold of [REDACTED] left wrist with his right hand, while applying a handcuff to [REDACTED] wrist using his left hand. [REDACTED] shouts, "I just left out of the house! Why are you doing me like this?" As PO Hernandez finishes handcuffing [REDACTED] PO David says, "This is because the way you're acting and for our safety." As PO David speaks with [REDACTED] PO Hernandez picks up [REDACTED] bag from the sidewalk and unzips the top zipper. PO Hernandez manipulates objects inside of the bag with his hands before placing the bag down and closing the zipper. PO Hernandez then asks [REDACTED] if he has any identification, and [REDACTED] tells PO Hernandez to look inside of the back of his telephone case. PO Hernandez takes the phone and removes [REDACTED] identification. [REDACTED] then asks, "And could you loosen up these handcuffs, please?" PO Hernandez says, "They're loose already," while PO David appears to check and to adjust the handcuffs. PO David walks towards the patrol car, leaving [REDACTED] with PO Hernandez. [REDACTED] asks PO Hernandez if the officers stopped him because he was a "new face" in the neighborhood, and PO Hernandez replies, "OK, if that's what you think."

[REDACTED] then asks PO Hernandez why the officers "singled him out," and PO Hernandez points down the sidewalk and says, "We just finished grabbing them . . . just finished talking to them." [REDACTED] replies, "You just grabbed them so that means come grab me?" PO Hernandez says, "mm hmm." Another marked CPD patrol car drives west on [REDACTED] and turns north into the alley on the west side of [REDACTED] stopping at the mouth of the alley. PO Hernandez walks back towards the street and hands [REDACTED] identification to PO David, who is now seated in

their unmarked gray patrol vehicle. PO Hernandez then turns around and walks back towards [REDACTED]. As PO Hernandez approaches [REDACTED], [REDACTED] says, "Can I have a white shirt here please?" PO Hernandez replies, "They'll be on the way." [REDACTED] says, "I ain't here nobody call over no radio for no white shirt," and PO Hernandez replies, "I don't fuckin' care what you heard, man. You don't tell me what to do." [REDACTED] says, "You work for me," and PO Hernandez replies, "The fuck I do. I work for myself, I don't work for you." [REDACTED] then shouts to a group of people on the sidewalk, "Can one of you all record this for me?"

PO Hernandez tells [REDACTED] to turn around, and [REDACTED] turns to face the fence, away from PO Hernandez. PO Hernandez removes the handcuffs from [REDACTED] wrists while PO David stands to the side. PO Hernandez asks PO David if he has an ISR receipt, and PO David says that he'll look for a receipt in their patrol car. [REDACTED] begins to manipulate his cell phone and holds the phone up, pointing towards PO Hernandez, as if he is taking a photograph or video recording. [REDACTED] asks PO Hernandez to confirm that his name is "Hernandez," and PO Hernandez confirms it. [REDACTED] asks PO David for his name and badge number, and PO David says, "Yeah, we're gonna give it to you right now," before walking back towards the patrol car.

[REDACTED] says to PO Hernandez, "Just put me in handcuffs like I'm a criminal," and PO Hernandez replies, "You got put in handcuffs because of the way you were acting." [REDACTED] says, "No, you put me in handcuffs because you thought I was a criminal." PO Hernandez replies, "I put you in handcuffs because you started pulling away, and you started yelling and spitting in my face." [REDACTED] reminds PO Hernandez that he asked for a white shirt, but PO Hernandez does not reply. PO Hernandez then turns towards the patrol vehicle and speaks briefly to PO David, who is now back in the driver's seat. PO Hernandez walks away from [REDACTED] enters the patrol vehicle on the passenger's side, sits down, and turns off his body-worn camera. The video recording then ends.

## 2. Body-Worn Camera, PO Andrew David<sup>23</sup>

Two recordings from PO David's body-worn camera were turned over to COPA.

### i. July 13, 2017, 6:53 p.m.

The first recording begins at 6:53:14 p.m. and is two minutes and two seconds long. The first thirty seconds of the recording are silent. The recording starts with PO David seated in the driver seat of a vehicle, in the process of closing the driver's door. The front passenger seat is empty. PO David places the vehicle in reverse, drives backwards while turning the wheel, and then pulls forward, stops the vehicle, and places it in park. PO David reaches across the front passenger seat and is handed a document by another officer who reaches into the passenger compartment from outside. At the 30-second mark, the audio recording begins, and PO David can be seen and heard typing on the vehicle's Police Data Terminal ("PDT").<sup>24</sup>

<sup>23</sup> Attachment 36.

<sup>24</sup> PDT messages from Beat 1061D on July 13, 2017, were obtained by COPA and made part of this investigation. A PDT Messages Report documents that Beat [REDACTED] conducted an Illinois Law Enforcement Agencies Data System (LEADS) check on [REDACTED] at 6:54 p.m. (Attachment 24)

After PO David completes his work on the PDT, he exits the vehicle holding an Illinois driver license or identification card. PO David walks to the rear of the vehicle, and the apartment building at [REDACTED] is visible to PO David's left. A marked CPD patrol vehicle is parked at the entrance to the alley on the west side of the apartment building. Pedestrians walk along the sidewalk, and PO David turns and walks from the street onto the sidewalk, west of the alley. As PO David turns to face the sidewalk, [REDACTED] can be seen standing perpendicular to a tall chain-link fence, and PO Hernandez is standing behind him. [REDACTED] is bending over slightly at the waist, and his hands are cuffed behind him. PO Hernandez removes the handcuffs while [REDACTED] asks the officers for their badge numbers. As the handcuffs are removed, [REDACTED] reaches into his pocket and retrieves a cell phone. PO Hernandez asks PO David if he has an ISR receipt, and PO David says that he might have one in the car. PO David walks back to their patrol vehicle, opens the front passenger-side door, and enters the vehicle. After a few seconds, PO David exits the vehicle and turns towards the sidewalk. The recording shows [REDACTED] standing on the sidewalk facing PO Hernandez and pointing his cellular phone at PO Hernandez. PO David then turns off his camera and the recording ends.

ii. July 13, 2017, 6:57 p.m.

The second recording begins at 6:57:05 and is three minutes and thirty-five seconds long. The first 30 seconds of the recording are silent. The recording starts with PO David seated in the driver seat of a parked vehicle. [REDACTED] is standing outside of the vehicle, facing the front driver-side window. When the audio begins at the 30-second mark, [REDACTED] is telling PO David that he has PO David's badge number. PO David tells [REDACTED] "You're standing in the middle of the street. You can get arrested right now." [REDACTED] walks around the front of the vehicle towards the side of the road. PO David remarks to PO Hernandez, "He was in the street before." PO David then tells [REDACTED] "You can't just walk in the middle of the street. It's illegal." [REDACTED] replies, "No, it's not." PO David asks [REDACTED] if he still wants to talk to the officers' sergeant, and [REDACTED] says yes. PO David tells [REDACTED] to wait, and then tells PO Hernandez, who is sitting in the passenger seat, to call the sergeant. PO David replies that he already called the sergeant, but the sergeant did not answer. While the officers discuss calling the sergeant, [REDACTED] continues talking, saying that the officers have violated his rights. PO Hernandez calls for the sergeant on the police radio while PO David speaks with [REDACTED].

PO David tells [REDACTED] "We told you why we put you in handcuffs. It's because of the way you were acting. We told you why we grabbed you and we told you why . . ." While PO David talks to [REDACTED] PO Hernandez can be heard speaking on the telephone. Only PO Hernandez's side of the telephone conversation is audible. PO Hernandez says, "This fuckin' clown over here wants to see our boss, so I just told him I'm gonna call you. I called you once but you didn't answer, so I had to go over the radio. He's a fuckin' idiot." PO Hernandez says "yes" and "alright" in response to the other party on the telephone call, and then the call ends.

[REDACTED] says that the officers racially discriminated against him. PO David says, "We racially discriminated . . . in your community," repeating what [REDACTED] told him. The officers then discuss asking the sergeant to bring an ISR receipt. [REDACTED] apparently hears the conversation between the officers and says, "See now they want to give me some more documentation. That's what they want to do right now." PO Hernandez replies to [REDACTED] and says, "We're not giving you anything." PO David again tells [REDACTED] that they could lock him up for being in the middle of the street and

obstructing traffic, but then tells [REDACTED] "We're giving you a break because I don't want to deal with you." [REDACTED] says that the officers are threatening him, and PO David replies, "We're not threatening you. I said that we should, but I'm not going to. . . . I already made my decision that I do not want to deal with you . . . just by talking to you." PO David then laughs, and PO Hernandez says, "We can go. He's on his way over here."

The officers speak to each other, and PO Hernandez says that the sergeant will bring the ISR receipt to [REDACTED]. PO David then tells [REDACTED] that the sergeant is on his way. The officers tell [REDACTED] that their body cameras recorded the incident and that [REDACTED] can speak to their sergeant about his complaint. PO David then tells [REDACTED] "We did everything right, and you did everything wrong." [REDACTED] says that he's going to report the officers for racial discrimination, and PO Hernandez responds, "Good luck with two Hispanic officers, idiot." PO David begins to drive away as he turns off his camera, and the recording ends.

#### D. [REDACTED] Cell-Phone Video Recording<sup>25</sup>

Complainant [REDACTED] provided COPA with a cell-phone video recording of his interaction with PO Hernandez and PO David. The recording is four minutes and thirty seconds long, and it appears to begin after the events depicted in the recording from PO Hernandez's body-worn camera. The recording begins with [REDACTED] standing in the street and recording the license plate number on the front of the officers' gray, unmarked patrol vehicle. [REDACTED] then walks onto the parkway between the sidewalk and street and approaches the passenger side of the vehicle. PO Hernandez is sitting in the passenger seat and his window is rolled down. [REDACTED] asks Hernandez, "Can I get your beat number too, sir," while repeating Hernandez's name and badge number. [REDACTED] then asks PO David for his badge number. PO David begins to reply, while [REDACTED] walks around the front of the car and approaches PO David from the driver's side. PO David's window is also rolled down, and [REDACTED] repeats PO David's badge number while PO David tells [REDACTED] that a sergeant is on his way. [REDACTED] tells PO David that he will wait for the sergeant, and repeats that he never gave the officers permission to search him or his personal property. PO David then tells [REDACTED] who is standing at the driver's window of the patrol vehicle, to get out of the street. [REDACTED] begins to walk towards the sidewalk while PO David tells him that he could be arrested for obstructing traffic.

[REDACTED] again stands on the parkway at the passenger side window of the patrol vehicle and continues to record. [REDACTED] tells the officers that they will hear from his lawyer because they violated his rights, and says that the officers racially discriminated against him. [REDACTED] also says that the officers are threatening him and coercing him. PO David tells [REDACTED] that the sergeant will be there soon, and [REDACTED] asks the officers not to leave before the sergeant arrives. [REDACTED] says that he's going to report the officers for racial discrimination, and PO Hernandez replies, "Good luck with two Hispanic officers, idiot."<sup>26</sup> The officers then drive away, and [REDACTED] walks towards the apartment building at [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] approaches a male child on the sidewalk and

<sup>25</sup> Attachment 8.

<sup>26</sup> From the recording alone, it is not clear which officer is speaking. PO David identified PO Hernandez as the person who made this statement during an interview with COPA on November 13, 2017. (Attachments 57, 83) PO Hernandez told COPA that he did not recall making the statement, but that he had no reason to doubt what was depicted in the recording. (Attachments 66, 67, 84, 85)

tells the child that he plans to walk “right to the police station” to file a complaint against the officers. The recording then ends.

### c. Documentary Evidence<sup>27</sup>

COPA searched for any Investigatory Stop Reports associated with [REDACTED] encounter with PO David and PO Hernandez, but none were found. COPA also searched for relevant surveillance video recordings from the CPD 10<sup>th</sup> District station, but no video surveillance equipment was installed in the front desk area.

COPA also obtained OEMC Records, including GPS Data, Unit History Report and Event Query, and Radio Transmissions. This information corroborated that Beat [REDACTED] stopped [REDACTED] and that a supervisor was dispatched to the scene.<sup>28</sup> In their statements to COPA, both PO Hernandez and PO David said that PO Hernandez spoke with Beat [REDACTED] Sergeant Onesto, by telephone shortly after they left the scene of [REDACTED] stop. Sgt. Onesto said that he had driven to the location, but he had been unable to locate the complainant.<sup>29</sup>

## VI. ANALYSIS

### 1. PO Hernandez and PO David were justified in stopping and searching [REDACTED] based on observing [REDACTED] walking in the roadway and based on [REDACTED] subsequent actions: throwing down his backpack, shouting, and pulling away from PO Hernandez.

[REDACTED] alleged that he was walking on the sidewalk when he was stopped and searched by the accused officers, and he further alleged that the officers had no justifiable reason for stopping him. PO Hernandez and PO David both described initially seeing [REDACTED] walking in the roadway – not on the sidewalk – and provided “obstruction of traffic” as the justification for the stop. While the available evidence is not entirely conclusive, there is substantial evidence demonstrating that the officers’ account is, more likely than not, correct. The available video evidence of the initial stop does not show [REDACTED] walking in the street, and the recorded portions of the initial encounter between [REDACTED] and the police take place on the parkway (the grassy area between the street and the sidewalk) and on the sidewalk. But there are several reasons to credit the officers’ accounts.

First, when [REDACTED] initially appears on PO Hernandez’s body-worn camera video recording, he is walking on the parkway and then steps back onto the sidewalk. In [REDACTED] account of the incident, he was walking out of an alley and had just reached the sidewalk when the encounter began. The video recording is more consistent with [REDACTED] walking from the road towards the sidewalk than with [REDACTED] walking out of the alley, from the opposite direction, and onto the sidewalk.

Second, PO David’s body-worn camera video recording captured a contemporaneous conversation between PO David and PO Hernandez, after they returned to their patrol vehicle,

<sup>27</sup> Attachments 11, 16, 31.

<sup>28</sup> Attachments 13, 14, 15, 19, 27.

<sup>29</sup> Attachments 56, 66, 82, 84.

where they discussed the fact that [REDACTED] had been in the roadway. It is highly unlikely that the officers made false statements to each other during their encounter with [REDACTED]. It is more likely that the officers' contemporaneous statements were true.

Third, PO David's body-worn camera video recording captured a conversation between PO David and [REDACTED]. PO David told [REDACTED], "You can't just walk in the middle of the street. It's illegal." [REDACTED] replied, "No, it's not." If [REDACTED] had not been walking in the street, he likely would have disputed PO David's factual assertion rather than disputing PO David's legal conclusion. In other words, he likely would have replied, "No, I wasn't," instead of, "No, it's not."

If the officers observed [REDACTED] walking in the roadway, they were justified in stopping [REDACTED] based on either the applicable municipal ordinance or the analogous state statute that prohibit this behavior.<sup>30</sup> Such a stop would be based on probable cause that [REDACTED] had violated the ordinance or the statute.<sup>31</sup>

When PO Hernandez ordered [REDACTED] to stop and approached [REDACTED] on foot, the available video and testimonial evidence shows that [REDACTED] immediately dropped his backpack to the ground and began shouting. The evidence also shows that [REDACTED] pulled away from PO Hernandez. PO Hernandez said that he heard a metal object hitting the ground when [REDACTED] dropped his backpack. [REDACTED] himself told investigators that his backpack contained haircutting equipment, which likely included electric shears. CPD's Special Order S04-13-09(c)(2) closely tracks the language of an Illinois statute, 725 ILCS 5/108-1.01, which provides in relevant part that "When a peace officer has stopped a person for temporary questioning pursuant to Section 107-14 of this Code and reasonably suspects that he or another is in *danger of attack*, he may search the person for weapons."<sup>32</sup> Illinois courts have interpreted 725 ILCS 5/108-1.01 to adhere to the United States Supreme Court's Fourth Amendment jurisprudence which requires that an officer believe the individual is **armed** and dangerous before performing a pat down during an investigatory stop.<sup>33</sup> In this case, the combination of [REDACTED] reaction to being approached by police and the sound that PO Hernandez heard when [REDACTED] backpack hit the ground gave PO Hernandez reason to suspect that [REDACTED] could be both armed and dangerous. The limited pat-down of [REDACTED] pockets and waistband, as well as the limited search of his backpack, which was terminated as soon as PO Hernandez determined that the backpack did not contain a weapon, were reasonable.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>30</sup> See Chi., Ill., Municipal Code § 9-80-180 (1990); 625 ILCS 5/11-1007(a).

<sup>31</sup> See *People v. Fitzpatrick*, 2011 IL App (2d) 100463 (holding that a custodial arrest, and subsequent search, for violating the Vehicle Code by walking in the middle of a public road did not violate the federal constitution or the Illinois state constitution's prohibition against unreasonable searches and seizures).

<sup>32</sup> Similar language is also used in the analogous city ordinance. See Chi., Ill., Municipal Code § 2-84-320 (1990).

<sup>33</sup> Any contrary interpretation of 725 ILCS 5/108-1.01 would be unconstitutional because Illinois law must comply with the United States Constitution. See, e.g., *People v. Walker*, 2013 IL App (4th) 120118.

<sup>34</sup> The United States Supreme Court has not directly opined on the extension of *Terry* from a frisk of a subject's outer clothing for weapons to a "frisk" of a subject's bag or backpack. The Illinois Supreme Court has also not directly addressed this issue, although the court did allow police to search inside a subject's boot, which had been removed from the subject's foot prior to the search, when the police reasonably suspected the boot might contain a knife. *People v. Sorenson*, 196 Ill. 2d 425 (2001). Other courts that have examined this issue have generally taken a fact-specific approach, and those courts have found searches of bags to be justified when the police had reason to believe the bag contained a weapon and the search was limited in scope to either confirm or dispel the officers' suspicion. See, e.g., *United States v. Walker*, 615 F.3d 728 (6th Cir. 2010); *Commonwealth v. Pagan*, 440 Mass. 62 (2003).

Allegation #1 against both PO Hernandez and PO David, that the officers used excessive force in stopping, seizing, and searching [REDACTED] is based on [REDACTED] allegation that the officers did not have any justifiable reason to stop him. If the stop was unjustified at its outset, then no amount of force, no matter how slight, would be justified. Likewise, Allegation #2 against both PO Hernandez and PO David is based on [REDACTED] allegation that the officers seized [REDACTED] without reasonable grounds to believe that [REDACTED] was committing, was about to commit, or had committed a crime. Because a preponderance of the available evidence shows that the stop was justified based on [REDACTED] walking in the roadway, COPA recommends that **Allegations #1 and #2 against both PO Hernandez and PO David be Unfounded.**

Allegation #3 against PO Hernandez – that PO Hernandez handcuffed [REDACTED] without reasonable grounds to believe that handcuffing [REDACTED] was necessary to preserve the officers' safety – is based [REDACTED] assertion that the stop was wholly unjustified and that he cooperated fully and did not pose any danger to the officers. If officers have legitimate and reasonable safety concerns during an investigatory stop they may handcuff a suspect for officer safety purposes. However, officers should not resort to handcuffing a suspect in the typical investigatory stop because “handcuffing is the type of action that may convert an investigatory stop into an arrest because it heightens the degree of intrusion.”<sup>35</sup> Ultimately, COPA need not address whether Officer Hernandez's handcuffing of [REDACTED] complied with *Terry*, as PO Hernandez had the authority to arrest [REDACTED] based on the violation he observed [REDACTED] commit. Therefore, COPA recommends that **Allegation #3 against PO Hernandez be Unfounded**. Likewise, COPA recommends that **Allegations #4 and #5 against PO Hernandez**, related to PO Hernandez frisking [REDACTED] and unzipping [REDACTED] bag to search for weapons, also be **Unfounded** for all the reasons cited above.

**2. The lack of any documented injury and the video and testimonial evidence that the involved officers immediately loosened [REDACTED] handcuffs when he asked them to do so show that PO Hernandez did not handcuff [REDACTED] too tightly.**

[REDACTED] alleged that PO Hernandez handcuffed him too tightly. [REDACTED] told investigators that there were marks on his wrists from the handcuffs that were visible immediately after he was released. These marks, however, were not visible the next day when [REDACTED] gave his statement to IPRA. [REDACTED] did not photograph the marks that were visible after the encounter, and he did not seek medical attention. The available body-worn camera video recordings do not show PO Hernandez using any unusual techniques while handcuffing [REDACTED]. While [REDACTED] shouts that he does not consent to being handcuffed or searched, he does not cry out in pain when the handcuffs are applied. Most significantly, when [REDACTED] says, “And could you loosen up these handcuffs,” PO David immediately checked and adjusted the handcuffs. Even if the handcuffs were initially too tight, it would not be appropriate to discipline the involved officers under circumstances where proper handcuffing techniques were used, where they caused no documented injury, and where they immediately adjusted and loosened the handcuffs at the request of the detainee. After PO David adjusted the handcuffs, [REDACTED] did not complain again prior to PO Hernandez removing the handcuffs, demonstrating that PO David's adjustment was satisfactory. Because a preponderance of the available evidence shows that PO Hernandez did not handcuff [REDACTED] too tightly, COPA recommends that **Allegation #6 against PO Hernandez be Unfounded**.

<sup>35</sup> *People v. Johnson*, 408 Ill. App. 3d 107, 113 (2d Dist. 2010).

3. PO Hernandez verbally maltreated [REDACTED] by directing profanity at [REDACTED] and by calling [REDACTED] an “idiot.”

The available body-worn camera recordings captured PO Hernandez saying, “I don’t fuckin’ care what you heard, man. I don’t work for you,” to [REDACTED] after [REDACTED] asked if a supervisor was coming to the scene of the stop. PO David identified PO Hernandez as the person who made this statement. PO Hernandez told investigators that he did not remember making the statement, but that he had “no reason to doubt what is depicted in the audio, or video.” Based on the body-worn camera recording and the statements of the involved officers, there is substantial evidence to show that PO Hernandez made this statement. Even if PO Hernandez was frustrated by [REDACTED] reaction to being stopped and offended by [REDACTED] insinuation that PO Hernandez was being unlawfully discriminatory, there is no possible justification for PO Hernandez using this language during an interaction with a civilian. [REDACTED] was already handcuffed and under control when PO Hernandez made this statement, so there is no reasonable argument that strong language was needed, or desirable, to change [REDACTED] behavior or get [REDACTED] attention. PO Hernandez’s language also goes directly against the ideals articulated in the Law Enforcement Code of Ethics: “The practice of courteous and respectful conduct by a member is not a manifestation of weakness; it is, on the contrary, entirely consistent with the firmness and impartiality that characterizes a professional police officer.” For these reasons, COPA recommends a finding of **Sustained for Allegation #7 against PO Hernandez**, in that PO Hernandez verbally maltreated [REDACTED] by saying words to the effect of “I don’t fuckin’ care what you heard man. I don’t work for you,” in response to [REDACTED] inquiry about a police supervisor responding to the scene of the stop, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 8, and 9.

A preponderance of the available evidence shows PO Hernandez said, “Good luck with two Hispanic officers, idiot” to [REDACTED]. Initially, allegations were made against both PO Hernandez and PO David regarding this statement, as the identity of the speaker had not been determined. This statement was made while PO Hernandez and PO David were seated in their patrol vehicle. Because the speaker’s face was not captured on video and the involved officers have similar voices, it was difficult to determine who was speaking in the recordings. When interviewed, however, PO David identified PO Hernandez as the person who made this statement. PO Hernandez told investigators that he did not recall making the statement, but he did not deny making the statement. PO Hernandez also said that he had “no reason to doubt what is depicted in the audio, or video.” The statement must have been made by one of the two officers, as no one else was present in the car.<sup>36</sup> Based on PO David’s identification of PO Hernandez as the speaker, and PO Hernandez’s inability to attribute the statement to anyone else, it is more likely than not that PO Hernandez made the statement. There is no conceivable justification for a CPD member to call a civilian an “idiot.” For these reasons, COPA recommends a finding of **Sustained for Allegation #9 against PO Hernandez**, in that PO Hernandez verbally maltreated [REDACTED] by saying words to the effect of “Good luck with two Hispanic officers, idiot,” in response to [REDACTED] saying that he planned to report Officer David and Officer Hernandez for racial discrimination, in violation of

<sup>36</sup> PO Hernandez said that his sergeant was on speaker-phone at some point during the encounter, but there is no indication on the recordings that a third person made this statement, and PO Hernandez did not identify his sergeant as the speaker. PO Hernandez also noted that [REDACTED] was speaking while the officers were speaking; but again, in listening to recordings, it is apparent that [REDACTED] did not call himself an idiot.

Rules 2, 3, 8, and 9. Because this statement was made by PO Hernandez, COPA recommends that **Allegation #3 against PO David be Unfounded**.

**4. Both PO David and PO Hernandez admit that an ISR was required to document stop, and PO David took responsibility for not filing the required report.**

CPD Special Order S04-13-09 requires that an ISR be completed for a stop based on probable cause when no other document captures the reason for detention. The same order also requires that an ISR be completed when a CPD member conducts a protective pat down or other search. Both PO Hernandez and PO David told investigators that they stopped [REDACTED] based on probable cause to believe that [REDACTED] was violating the law by walking in the roadway and obstructing traffic. The officers used their discretion not to cite or arrest [REDACTED] and the officers did not create any other record of the stop. PO Hernandez performed a protective pat down of [REDACTED] because PO Hernandez suspected that [REDACTED] might be armed, and PO David helped PO Hernandez control [REDACTED] while PO Hernandez performed the pat down. Based on either the “probable-cause-stop-when-no-other-document-captures-the-reason-for-the-detention” or the “protective-pat-down-or-other-search” prong of Special Order S04-13-09, the involved officers were required to complete an ISR. It is undisputed that the officers did not complete an ISR, and both officers readily admitted that an ISR was required.

PO Hernandez said that he believed PO David was going to complete the ISR because PO David had collected [REDACTED] identifying information. PO David said that he, and not PO Hernandez, was responsible for completing the ISR because he had the necessary information. Both officers described using a system to divide their labor whereby the officer who had taken the subject’s information was responsible for completing the ISR. Because it is undisputed that an ISR was required and because PO David took responsibility for failing to complete the ISR, COPA recommends a finding of **Sustained for Allegation #4 against PO David**, in that PO David did not document stopping [REDACTED] by completing an Investigatory Stop Report in violation of Rules 2, 3, 10, and 11. Correspondingly, COPA recommends that **Allegation #8 against PO Hernandez be Exonerated** because PO Hernandez was justified in relying on his partner to complete the report.

**5. Sergeant Vega did not initiate an investigation of [REDACTED] complaint because Sergeant Salvador caused [REDACTED] to leave the 10<sup>th</sup> District police station before Sergeant Vega had obtained the necessary information.**

It is undisputed that [REDACTED] went to the 10<sup>th</sup> District station to file a complaint against PO Hernandez and PO David and that Sgt. Vega, the desk sergeant, spoke with [REDACTED]. Both Sgt. Vega’s account and [REDACTED] account are generally consistent: [REDACTED] told Sgt. Vega that he wanted to file a complaint against officers who had stopped him earlier in the day; Sgt. Vega attempted to look up the involved officers’ badge numbers in her computer, but did not identify the officers; Sgt. Vega asked [REDACTED] to wait in the lobby while she worked on other tasks; and [REDACTED] left the station after Sgt. Salvador told [REDACTED] that he was not allowed to record the goings-on in the lobby with his cell phone. At the time of her encounter with [REDACTED] Sgt. Vega was both new to 10<sup>th</sup> District and new to the rank of sergeant. A more experienced sergeant may have handled [REDACTED] complaint differently and may have re-prioritized other tasks so that she could turn her

attention to [REDACTED] complaint sooner. And it is troubling that Sgt. Vega told [REDACTED] he would have to wait – without providing [REDACTED] with any estimate as to how long he would be waiting. Sgt. Vega should have realized that this could lead [REDACTED] to believe, correctly or not, that his complaint was not being taken seriously. But it is also undisputed that Sgt. Vega was, in fact, quite busy processing fresh arrests at the time [REDACTED] came to the station and that [REDACTED] complicated the matter by providing incorrect star numbers for the involved officers.<sup>37</sup> Significantly, [REDACTED] recalled telling Sgt. Vega that he had “all the time in the world” to wait; Sgt. Vega may have taken [REDACTED] at his word when she was prioritizing her tasks. Had there been no intervening factor, [REDACTED] likely would have waited and Sgt. Vega likely would have registered [REDACTED] complaint.

But there was an intervening factor: Sergeant Salvador. As discussed in more detail below, Sgt. Salvador saw that [REDACTED] was apparently recording the events taking place in the lobby of the station using his cell phone. Sgt. Salvador ordered [REDACTED] to stop recording, and Sgt. Salvador told [REDACTED] he would have to leave the station or face arrest if he did not stop. Faced with this choice, [REDACTED] walked out of the station and did not return. There is no evidence that Sgt. Vega asked Sgt. Salvador to intervene, and there is no evidence that Sgt. Vega ever ordered [REDACTED] to stop recording. At the time [REDACTED] left the station, Sgt. Vega did not have enough information to initiate a log number investigation: she did not know [REDACTED] name, the names of the involved officers, the time or location of the encounter that gave rise to the complaint, or the type of conduct that [REDACTED] was complaining about. Because Sgt. Vega made appropriate efforts to take [REDACTED] complaint and only failed to take the complaint because of Sgt. Salvador’s intervening act, COPA recommends that **Allegation #1 against Sgt. Vega be Exonerated.**

#### **6. Sergeant Salvador ordered [REDACTED] to stop recording in the lobby of the 10<sup>th</sup> District police station without proper justification.**

Sgt. Salvador readily admitted to investigators that he ordered [REDACTED] to stop recording when he saw [REDACTED] using his cell phone to record in the lobby of the police station. Sgt. Salvador also admitted that the lobby was a public place, and that both CPD policy and Illinois law generally prohibit a law-enforcement officer from hindering a person from recording a law enforcement officer who is performing his or her duties in a public place.<sup>38</sup> Sgt. Salvador explained that he believed it was necessary to prevent [REDACTED] from recording in the lobby to protect the confidentiality of potential crime victims who may have been making reports and the privacy of potential confidential informants who may have been in the lobby to meet with police. Sgt. Salvador specifically mentioned that he was thinking of possible rape victims, juvenile victims of crime, domestic battery victims, witnesses in general, and parents taking advantage of the police station as a “safe haven” for surrendering newborns. But Sgt. Salvador also told investigators that he did not know if any such people were actually in the lobby at the time; he saw that there were people in the lobby, and he was concerned with the possibility that they could fall into one (or more) of these categories. If such people were present, the CPD members dealing with them should have taken them to a more private area – not the lobby.

<sup>37</sup> The available body-worn camera and cell-phone video recordings show that PO Hernandez and PO David provided their correct names and correct star numbers. [REDACTED] provided incorrect star numbers for these officers during his initial interview with IPRA, and he likely provided the same incorrect star numbers to Sgt. Vega.

<sup>38</sup> See Special Order S03-14 § III.C; 50 ILCS 706/10-20(a)(11).

Sgt. Salvador also cited the provisions of a Chicago municipal ordinance that prohibits the use of camera/cell phones to record images in what are defined as “public privacy areas.” Police station lobbies are not specifically included in the definition of “public privacy areas,” but the definition does include “areas where a person should reasonably expect to have privacy, **including but not limited to** showers, locker rooms/changing rooms, bathrooms, lactation rooms, automatic teller machine areas, and cashier lines.”<sup>39</sup> Sgt. Salvador noted that an ATM is located just inside the entrance to the lobby, and that people reporting crimes could be providing personal information to the police and would reasonably expect to have privacy in the lobby while doing so. But Sgt. Salvador also acknowledged that the ATM was at the opposite end of the lobby from where [REDACTED] was interacting with Sgt. Vega, that he did not recall if anyone was using the ATM, and that he did not know if anyone in the lobby was reporting private or confidential information. Sgt. Salvador added that [REDACTED] might have been recording when he walked past the ATM, but there was no indication that [REDACTED] lingered in that area or was attempting to record people using the ATM.

Sgt. Salvador’s interpretation of both the municipal ordinance and the state statute is overbroad and contrary to the laws’ intent. The Appellate Court of Illinois has specifically held that there is no reasonable expectation of privacy in the lobby of a police station, and that a person speaking in the lobby of a police station would not have “a reasonable subjective belief that any conversation held in the lobby would be a private one.”<sup>40</sup> The Chicago ordinance prohibiting recording in an ATM area is unambiguously intended to prohibit recording people who are using an ATM – not to prohibit all recording anywhere near an ATM. And Sgt. Salvador made it clear that he believed he had the authority to prohibit anyone from recording in the lobby of the police station at any time: “I’m pretty sure that I, in my position, and in my experience, I have the knowledge to make the call to say, hey, you can’t record because we have rape victims, domestic battery victims, juveniles, children, safe haven.” COPA disagrees. If such a broad prohibition on recording in the lobbies of CPD district stations was lawful and in accordance with the Department’s mission and goals, it would only be properly implemented at the order of the Superintendent – not by an individual sergeant.<sup>41</sup> Because a preponderance of the evidence demonstrates that Sgt. Salvador was not justified in ordering [REDACTED] to either stop recording or to leave the station, COPA recommends a finding of **Sustained for Allegation #1 against Sgt. Salvador**, in that Sgt. Salvador hindered or prevented [REDACTED] from recording a law enforcement officer who was performing his or her duties in a public place by ordering [REDACTED] to turn off his cellular telephone while [REDACTED] was recording officers in the lobby of the CPD District 010 station, in violation of Rules 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9.

<sup>39</sup> Chi. Ill., Municipal Code § 8-4-125 (2004) (emphasis added).

<sup>40</sup> *People v. Calvert*, 258 Ill. App. 3d 504, 514 (1994).

<sup>41</sup> COPA is not suggesting that an order totally prohibiting recording in the lobbies of police stations would, in fact, be lawful.

## VII. CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis set forth above, COPA makes the following findings:

Officer	Allegation	Finding
Police Officer Marcos Hernandez	1. Used excessive force in stopping, seizing, and searching [REDACTED] in violation of Rules 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, and 10, and;  2. Seized [REDACTED] without reasonable grounds to believe that [REDACTED] was committing, was about to commit, or had committed a crime, in violation of Rules 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 10, and 11, and;  3. Handcuffed [REDACTED] without reasonable grounds to believe that handcuffing [REDACTED] was necessary to preserve his own safety or Police Officer Andrew David's safety, in violation of Rules 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, and 10, and;  4. Frisked [REDACTED] without reasonable grounds to believe that [REDACTED] was armed and dangerous, in violation of Rules 1, 2, 3, 6, 10, and 11, and;  5. Searched [REDACTED] tote bag without reasonable grounds to believe the bag contained a weapon, in violation of Rules 1, 2, 3, 8, 10, and 11, and;  6. Handcuffed [REDACTED] more tightly than reasonably necessary, in violation of Rules 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, and 10, and;  7. Verbally maltreated [REDACTED] by saying words to the effect of "I don't fuckin' care what you heard, man. I don't work for you," in response to [REDACTED] inquiry about a police supervisor responding to the scene of the stop, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 8, and 9, and;  8. Did not document stopping [REDACTED] by completing an Investigatory Stop Report, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 10, and 11, and;	Unfounded  Unfounded  Unfounded  Unfounded  Unfounded  Unfounded  Sustained  Exonerated

	9. Verbally maltreated [REDACTED] by saying words to the effect of "Good luck with two Hispanic officers, idiot," in response to Derrick Smith saying that he planned to report Officer David and Officer Hernandez for racial discrimination, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 8, and 9.	Sustained
Police Officer Andrew David	1. Used excessive force in stopping, seizing, and searching [REDACTED] in violation of Rules 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, and 10, and;	Unfounded
	2. Seized [REDACTED] without reasonable grounds to believe that [REDACTED] was committing, was about to commit, or had committed a crime, in violation of Rules 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 10, and 11, and;	Unfounded
	3. Verbally maltreated [REDACTED] by saying words to the effect of "Good luck with two Hispanic officers, idiot," in response to [REDACTED] saying that he planned to report Officer David and Officer Hernandez for racial discrimination, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 8, and 9, and;	Unfounded
	4. Did not document stopping [REDACTED] by completing an Investigatory Stop Report, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 10, and 11.	Sustained
Sergeant of Police Thelma Vega	1. Did not initiate an investigation of [REDACTED] complaint regarding the conduct of Officer Hernandez and Officer David as required by General Order G08-01-02, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, and 10.	Exonerated
Sergeant of Police Richard Salvador	1. Hindered or prevented [REDACTED] from recording a law enforcement officer who was performing his or her duties in a public place by ordering [REDACTED] to turn off his cellular telephone while [REDACTED] was recording officers in the lobby of the CPD District 010 station.	Sustained

Approve

3/19/18  
Date

*Deputy Chief Administrator – Chief Investigator*

Appendix A

Assigned Investigative Staff

<b>Squad#:</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Investigator:</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Supervising Investigator:</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Deputy Chief Administrator:</b>	[REDACTED]

## Appendix B

### Applicable Rules and Law

---

#### Rules

---

##### **I. Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department**

**Article I.A(2) of the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department provides the following general regulation:**

A large urban society free from crime and disorder remains an unachieved ideal, nevertheless, consistent with the values of a free society, it is the primary objective of the Chicago Police Department to as closely as possible approach that ideal. In doing so, the Department's role is to enforce the law in a fair and impartial manner, recognizing both the statutory and judicial limitations of police authority and the constitutional rights of all persons.

**Article I.B of the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department provides the following standards of conduct:**

3. The Law Enforcement Code of Ethics is adopted as a general standard of conduct for all sworn members of the Department. It states:

...

- a. As a law enforcement officer, my fundamental duty is to serve mankind; to safeguard lives and property, to protect the innocent against deception, the weak against oppression or intimidation, and the peaceful against violence or disorder and to respect the Constitutional rights of all men to liberty, equality, and justice.

...

- c. I will never act officiously or permit personal feelings, prejudices, animosities, or friendships to influence my decisions. With no compromise for crime and with relentless prosecution of criminals, I will enforce the law courteously and appropriately without fear or favor, malice or ill will, never employing unnecessary force or violence . . . .

5. A police officer is the most conspicuous representative of government, and to the majority of the people he is a symbol of stability and authority upon whom they can rely. An officer's conduct is closely scrutinized, and when his actions are found to be excessive, unwarranted or unjustified he, and the Department, are criticized for more severely than comparable conduct of persons in other walks of life. Since the conduct of a member, on or off duty, does reflect directly upon the Department, a member must at all times conduct himself in

---

a manner which does not bring discredit to himself, the Department or the city.

6. Effective law enforcement depends upon a high degree of cooperation between the Department and the public it serves. The practice of courtesy in all public contacts encourages understanding and appreciation; courtesy breeds contempt and resistance. The majority of the public are law abiding citizens who rightfully expect fair and courteous treatment by members of the Department. While the urgency of a given situation would demand firm action, courtesy or disrespect shown toward a citizen is indefensible. The practice of courteous and respectful conduct by a member is not a manifestation of weakness; it is, on the contrary, entirely consistent with the firmness and impartiality that characterizes a professional police officer.
10. A recognition of individual dignity is vital in a free system of law. Just as all persons are subject to the law, all persons have a right to dignified treatment under the law, and the protection of this right is a duty which is as binding on the Department and each of its members, as any other. Every member must treat each person with respect and he must be constantly mindful that the people with whom he is dealing are individuals with human emotions and needs. Such recognition and conduct is not an additional duty imposed to a member's primary responsibilities, it is inherent in them.
13. Daily contact with citizens is the level that bears the greatest burden for strengthening community relations. In dealing with people each member must strive to make his contact one which inspires respect for himself as an individual and as a professional. No member can allow his individual feelings and/or prejudices to enter into his public contacts. Every member must constantly be aware of and eliminate any attitudes which might impair his effectiveness and impartiality.

**Article IV.C of the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department includes the following requirements:**

1. Render the highest order of police service to all citizens, whether or not during specifically assigned hours.
2. Obey all laws and promptly execute all lawful orders
3. Know and conform to the Department's Policy, Rules, Regulations, Orders, Procedures and Directives.
4. Receive, record and service immediately all complaints and requests for service in accordance with Department Orders.

---

- 5. Provide security and care for all persons and property coming into their custody.
- 6. Maintain a military bearing and render military courtesy while in uniform.
- 7. Maintain a courteous and respectful attitude towards all persons.

**Article V, Rules of Conduct, of the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department includes the following prohibitions:**

Rule 1: Violation of any law or ordinance.

Rule 2: Any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department.

COMMENT: This Rule applies to both the professional and private conduct of all members. It prohibits any and all conduct which is contrary to the letter and spirit of Departmental policy or goals or which would reflect adversely upon the Department or its members. It includes not only all unlawful acts by members but also all acts, which although not unlawful in themselves, would degrade or bring disrespect upon the member or the Department . . . . It also includes any action contrary to the stated policy, goals, rules, regulations, orders or directives of the Department.

Rule 3: Any failure to promote the Department's efforts to implement its policy or accomplish its goals.

COMMENT: This Rule prohibits any omission or failure to act by any member of the Department, whether on or off duty, which act would be required by the stated policy, goals, rules, regulations, orders and directives of the Department. It applies to supervisory and other members who, through carelessness, inefficiency or design fail to implement all policy goals, rules, regulations, orders and directives of the Department or fail to report to the Department any and all known violations of same, or who through carelessness, inefficiency or design fail to become aware of any such violation, when their assigned duty or supervisory responsibility would require them to become so aware.

Rule 6: Disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral.

COMMENT: This Rule prohibits disobedience by a member of any lawful written or oral order or directive from a superior officer or another member of any rank who is relaying the order of a superior.

Rule 8: Disrespect to or maltreatment of any person, while on or off duty.

---

Rule 9: Engaging in any unjustified verbal or physical altercation with any person, while on or off duty.

COMMENT: Rules 8 and 9 prohibit the use of any excessive force by any member. These rules prohibit all brutality, and physical or verbal maltreatment of any citizen while on or off duty, including any unjustified altercation of any kind.

Rule 10: Inattention to duty.

Rule 11: Incompetency or inefficiency in the performance of duty.

---

## General Orders

---

### **1. General Order G03-02, Use of Force Guidelines**

In relevant part, this order provides:

III.A When a Department member engages a member of the public, the member will do so in such a manner which affords that person the respect and dignity to which all persons are entitled. The use of excessive force or unwarranted physical force or unprofessional conduct by a Department member will not be tolerated under any circumstances, and all members will strictly adhere to the provisions of the Department directive entitled "Prohibition Regarding Racial Profiling and Other Bias Based Policing."

III.B Department members will use an amount of force reasonably necessary based on the totality of the circumstances to perform a lawful task, effect an arrest, overcome resistance, control a subject, or protect themselves or others from injury.

### **2. General Order G03-02-02, Force Options**

In relevant part, this order provides:

II.D Members will maintain a courteous and professional demeanor when dealing with the public.

II.F Members will continually assess the situation to determine:

1. if any use of force option is necessary;
2. the appropriate level of force option based on the totality of the circumstances; and
3. if the level of force employed should be modified based upon the subject's actions or other changes in the circumstances. The level of force should be de-escalated immediately as resistance decreases, while staying in control and as safety permits, and in accordance with the Department directive entitled "The Use of Force Model."

---

## Special Orders

---

### 1. Special Order S03-14, Body Worn Cameras

In relevant part, this order provides:

III.C According to law, no officer may hinder or prevent any non-officer from recording a law enforcement officer who is performing his or her duties in a public place or when the officer has no reasonable expectation of privacy. Violation of this law may constitute disciplinary actions consistent with the directive entitled “Complaint and Disciplinary Procedures” as well as criminal penalties such as theft or criminal damage to property. However, a member may take reasonable actions to enforce the law and perform their duties.

### 2. Special Order S04-13-09, Investigatory Stop System

In relevant part, this order provides:

**VII.B.1** The Investigatory Stop Database will only be used to document: (a) Investigatory Stops, Probable Cause stops when no other document captures the reason for the detention, Protective Pat Downs or other searches . . . .

**VII.B.4** Sworn members are responsible for entering all Investigatory Stop Reports created during their tours of duty into the electronic system as soon as possible but no later than the end of their tours of duty . . . .

**VIII.A.1** Sworn members who conduct an Investigatory Stop, Probable Cause stop when no other document captures the reason for the detention, and, if applicable, a Protective Pat Down or other search in a public place, are required to submit an Investigatory Stop Report into the Investigatory Stop Database. All of the factors that support Reasonable Articulable Suspicion in order to temporarily detain an individual for investigation, Probable Cause when a stop is made and no other document captures the reason for detention, and, if applicable, all of the factors that support Reasonable Articulable Suspicion in order to perform a Protective Pat Down will be documented in the narrative portions of the database.

**NOTE:** For purposes of this directive, “public place” means any place to which the public or a substantial group of the public has access and includes, but is not limited to, streets, highways, parks, and the common areas of schools, hospitals, apartment buildings, office buildings, transport facilities, and stores.

This order also provides the following definitions:

**Investigatory Stop** – The temporary detention and questioning of a person in the vicinity where the person was stopped based on Reasonable Articulable Suspicion that the person is committing, is about to commit, or has committed a criminal offense. The suspect may be detained only for the length of time necessary to confirm or dispel the suspicion of criminal activity. . . .

**Protective Pat Down** – A limited search during an Investigatory Stop in which the sworn member conducts a pat down of the outer clothing of a person for weapons for the protection of the sworn member or others in the area. If, during a Protective Pat Down of the outer clothing, the sworn member touches an object which the sworn member reasonably believes is a weapon, the sworn member may reach into that area of the clothing and retrieve the object. A Protective Pat Down is not a general exploratory search for evidence of criminal activity.

**Reasonable Articulable Suspicion** – Reasonable Articulable Suspicion is an objective legal standard that is less than probable cause but more substantial than a hunch or general suspicion. Reasonable Articulable Suspicion depends on the totality of the circumstances which the sworn member observes and the reasonable inferences that are drawn based on the sworn member's training and experience. Reasonable Articulable Suspicion can result from a combination of particular facts, which may appear innocuous in and of themselves, but taken together amount to reasonable suspicion.

Reasonable Articulable Suspicion should be founded on specific and objective facts or observations about how a suspect behaves, what the subject is seen or heard doing, and the circumstances or situation in regard to the suspect that is either witnessed or known by the officer. Accordingly, Reasonable Articulable Suspicion must be described with reference to facts or observations about a particular suspect's actions or the particular circumstances that an officer encounters. The physical characteristics of a suspect are never, by themselves, sufficient. Instead, those characteristics must be combined with other factors, including a specific, non-general description matching the suspect or the observed behaviors of the suspect.

1. For Investigatory Stops, a sworn member must possess specific and articulable facts which, combined with rational inferences from these facts, reasonably warrant a belief that the suspect is committing, is about to commit, or has committed a criminal offense.
2. For a Protective Pat Down, a sworn member must possess specific and articulable facts, combined with rational inferences from these facts, that the suspect is armed and dangerous or reasonably suspects that the person presents a danger of attack to the sworn member or others in the area.

**NOTE:** An Investigatory Stop and a Protective Pat Down are two distinct actions – both require independent, Reasonable Articulable Suspicion (i.e., to stop a person

there must be reasonable suspicion of criminal activity, and to stop a person and perform a Protective Pat Down of the person, there must be reasonable suspicion of criminal activity and reasonable suspicion that the person is armed and dangerous or presents a danger of attack).

**Probable Cause** – Probable cause exists where the police have knowledge of facts that would lead a reasonable person to believe that a crime has occurred and that the subject has committed it. This differs from Reasonable Articulable Suspicion in that the facts supporting RAS do not need to meet probable cause requirements, but they must justify more than a mere hunch. The facts should not be viewed with analytical hindsight but instead should be considered from the perspective of a reasonable officer at the time that situation confronted him or her.

---

#### Federal Laws

---

##### **1. Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution**

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated . . . .

---

#### State Laws

---

##### **1. Illinois Constitution, Section 6. Searches, Seizures, Privacy and Interceptions**

The people shall have the right to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and other possessions against unreasonable searches, seizures, invasions of privacy or interceptions of communications by eavesdropping devices or other means.

##### **2. 50 ILCS 706/10-20(a)(11)**

No officer may hinder or prohibit any person, not a law enforcement officer, from recording a law enforcement officer in the performance of his or her duties in a public place or when the officer has no reasonable expectation of privacy. The law enforcement agency's written policy shall indicate the potential criminal penalties, as well as any departmental discipline, which may result from unlawful confiscation or destruction of the recording medium of a person who is not a law enforcement officer. However, an officer may take reasonable action to maintain safety and control, secure crime scenes and accident sites, protect the integrity and confidentiality of investigations, and protect the public safety and order.

##### **3. 625 ILCS 5/11-1007(a)**

[W]here a sidewalk is provided and its use is practicable, it shall be unlawful for any pedestrian to walk along and upon an adjacent roadway.

**4. 725 ILCS 5/107-2(1)(c)**

A peace officer may arrest a person when . . . [h]e has reasonable grounds to believe that the person is committing or has committed an offense.

**5. 725 ILCS 5/107-14**

- (a) A peace officer, after having identified himself as a peace officer, may stop any person in a public place for a reasonable period of time when the officer reasonably infers from the circumstances that the person is committing, is about to commit or has committed an offense as defined in Section 102-15 of this Code, and may demand the name and address of the person and an explanation of his actions. Such detention and temporary questioning will be conducted in the vicinity of where the person was stopped.
- (b) Upon completion of any stop under subsection (a) involving a frisk or search, and unless impractical, impossible, or under exigent circumstance, the officer shall provide the person with a stop receipt which provides the reason for the stop and contains the officer's name and badge number. . . .

**6. 725 ILCS 5/108-1.01**

When a peace officer has stopped a person for temporary questioning . . . and reasonably suspects that he or another is in danger of attack, he may search the person for weapons. If the officer discovers a weapon, he may take it until the completion of the questioning, at which time he shall either return the weapon, if lawfully possessed, or arrest the person so questioned.

---

**City Ordinances**

---

**1. CHI., ILL., MUNICIPAL CODE § 2-84-230 (1990)**

The members of the police department shall have power: (1) To arrest or cause to be arrested, with or without process, all persons who break the peace, or are found violating any municipal ordinance or any criminal law of the state.

**2. Chi., Ill., Municipal Code § 2-84-310 (1990)**

A police officer having identified himself as a police officer may stop any person in a public place whom the officer reasonably suspects is committing, has committed or is about to commit a criminal offense under the laws of the State of Illinois or a violation of Chapter 8-20 of this Code, and may demand the name and address of such person and an explanation of his actions.

**3. Chi., Ill., Municipal Code § 2-84-320 (1990)**

When a police officer having identified himself as a police officer has stopped a person for temporary questioning and reasonably suspects that he is in danger of

attack, he may search such person for dangerous weapons. If the officer discovers such weapons he may take such property until completion of the questioning, at which time he shall either return such property if lawfully possessed or arrest the person.

**4. CHI., ILL., MUNICIPAL CODE § 8-4-125 (2004)**

No person shall use a camera/cell phone or other device capable of preserving and/or transmitting an image in any public "privacy area". For purposes of this section, "privacy area" shall be defined as rooms in structures, or other areas whether or not enclosed, designated for the administration of examinations, clinics, hospitals and areas where a person should reasonably expect to have privacy, including but not limited to showers, locker rooms/changing rooms, bathrooms, lactation rooms, automatic teller machine areas, and cashier lines. Possession of said devices in these areas is lawful if the image preserving and/or transmitting portion of the device is not operational.

**5. CHI., ILL., MUNICIPAL CODE § 9-80-180 (1990)**

Any person who shall willfully and unnecessarily hinder, obstruct or delay or who shall willfully and unnecessarily attempt to hinder, obstruct or delay any other person in lawfully driving or travelling along or upon any street . . . or who shall repeatedly cause motor vehicles travelling on public thoroughfares to stop or impede the flow of traffic shall be guilty of a misdemeanor . . . .


[Print](#) | [Logout](#) | [Help](#)
[View Incident](#)
[Home](#) » [Administrative Investigations IAD/COPA](#) » [View Incident](#)
[Print Face Sheet](#) | [Print Current Case Summary](#)
[< Return](#) | [Incident Review](#) | [Investigation](#)

### Reporting Category

Category	Subcategory	Situation	Victim/Offender Armed?	Weapon Types	Weapon Other	Weapon Recovered?	Deceased?
05B EXCESSIVE FORCE / ON DUTY - NO INJURY -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

row(s) 1 - 1 of 1

Log No: 1085939 Type:CR

### Accused Members

Review Name	Status	Accused Overall Finding	Recommended Penalty	No. of Days	Date/Time Served	Created Date	Complimentary History
<a href="#">View</a> VEGA, THELMA	CLOSED/FINAL	EXONERATED	-	-	-	14-JUL-2017	N/A
<a href="#">View</a> DAVID, ANDREW	PENDING ACCUSED APPEAL	SUSTAINED	SUSPENSION	5	-	14-JUL-2017	<a href="#">View</a>
<a href="#">View</a> HERNANDEZ, MARCOS	PENDING ACCUSED APPEAL	SUSTAINED	SUSPENSION	10	-	14-JUL-2017	<a href="#">View</a>
<a href="#">View</a> SALVADOR, RICHARD	PENDING FINANCE DIVISION RESPONSE	SUSTAINED	REPRIMAND	-	-	27-NOV-2017	<a href="#">View</a>

row(s) 1 - 4 of 4

### Attachments

No.	Type	Related Person	No. of Pages	Narrative	Original in File	Entered By	Entered Date/Time	Status	Approve Content?	Inclusion?
<a href="#">View</a> 1	FACE SHEET	N/A	-	-	-	STEWART, DENISE	JUL-14-2017 14:19	-	-	-
<a href="#">View</a> 2	CONFLICT CERTIFICATION	N/A	-	-	-	CLARK, MARK	JUL-21-2017 16:38	-	-	-
<a href="#">View</a> 3	CONFLICT CERTIFICATION	N/A	-	-	-	MASTERS, GREG	JUL-24-2017 11:41	-	-	-
<a href="#">View</a> 4	CONSENT FOR AUDIO RECORDED INTERVIEW	N/A	1	Complainant [REDACTED] consent to record interview, 14 July 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JUL-31-2017 12:42	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 5	PHOTO IDENTIFICATION	N/A	1	Copy of complainant [REDACTED]	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JUL-31-2017 12:44	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 6	SWORN AFFIDAVIT FROM COMPLAINANT	N/A	1	Complainant [REDACTED] affidavit, 14 July 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JUL-31-2017 12:45	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 7	AUDIO RECORDING	N/A	1	Complainant [REDACTED] take interview, 14 July 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JUL-31-2017 13:35	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 8	VIDEO RECORDING	N/A	1	Complainant [REDACTED] video recording of involved officers, 13 July 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JUL-31-2017 13:38	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 9	ATTENDANCE AND ASSIGNMENT RECORD	N/A	9	District 10 4th Watch A&A sheets, accessed 17 July 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JUL-31-2017 14:13	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 10	REPORT (OTHER)	N/A	1	In-car video and body worn camera request.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JUL-31-2017 14:18	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 11	REPORT (OTHER)	N/A	2	Request for District 10 front desk surveillance video recording.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JUL-31-2017 14:19	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 12	REPORT (OTHER)	N/A	2	Watch Information: Hernandez, Marcos, C, Star No. 7917.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JUL-31-2017 14:23	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 13	GPS DATA	N/A	5	GPS Report for CPD vehicle 4862, 13 July 2017, 18:00:00 to 20:00:00.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JUL-31-2017 14:26	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 14	OEMC EVENT QUERY	N/A	2	Event Query for event number [REDACTED].	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JUL-31-2017 14:28	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 15	OEMC UNIT QUERY	N/A	4	Unit History Report for beat 1061D, 13 July 2017, 18:00:00 to 20:00:00.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JUL-31-2017 14:30	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 16	REPORT (OTHER)	N/A	6	Investigatory Stop Search - Negative	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JUL-31-2017 14:33	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 17	REPORT (OTHER)	N/A	1		YES	MASTERS, GREG		APPROVED	-	YES

<a href="#">View</a>	18	ATTENDANCE AND ASSIGNMENT RECORD	N/A	4	Service Call Search, 3300 to 3600 W 21st St, 13 Jul 2017. Negative.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JUL-31-2017 14:35	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	19	O.E.M.C. (OEMC) REQUEST/HOLD	N/A	3	District 10, 4th Watch A&A sheet for 13 July 2017, accessed 25 July 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JUL-31-2017 14:37	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	20	REPORT (OTHER)	N/A	1	OEMC request for Zone 10 radio transmissions and Beat 1061D PDT messages.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JUL-31-2017 14:42	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	21	CANVASS SHEETS	N/A	4	POD search, 3434 W 21st Street.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JUL-31-2017 14:48	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	22	TO/FROM REPORT	N/A	1	Canvass sheets, 27 July 2017, [REDACTED]	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JUL-31-2017 14:49	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	23	REPORT (OTHER)	N/A	1	Attempt to Obtain 3rd-Party Video Recording	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JUL-31-2017 14:52	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	24	REPORT (OTHER)	N/A	10	Arrest Report Search, Beat of Arrest 1024, 13 July 2017 through 20 July 2017. Negative.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JUL-31-2017 14:55	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	25	TO/FROM REPORT	N/A	1	PDT Message Report for Beats 1061D and 1061, 18:30 to 19:30, 13 July 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JUL-31-2017 14:57	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	26	TO/FROM REPORT	N/A	3	Witness Telephone Conversation: [REDACTED]	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JUL-31-2017 14:59	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	27	AUDIO RECORDING	N/A	1	Photograph of involved officer provided by complainant.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	SEP-05-2017 15:40	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	28	REPORT (OTHER)	N/A	58	Recording of Zone 10 radio transmissions, 13 July 2017, 1830 to 1930.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	SEP-05-2017 16:13	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	29	CHICAGO POLICE DEPARTMENT EVENT QUERY	N/A	1	OEMC Report, radio transmission record details, zone 10, 1830-1930, 13 July 17.	NO	MASTERS, GREG	SEP-05-2017 16:14	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	30	REPORT (OTHER)	N/A	4	CPD Event Query, Event No. [REDACTED]	NO	MASTERS, GREG	SEP-05-2017 16:16	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	31	TO/FROM REPORT	N/A	1	PDT Messages Report, 13 July 2017, Unit [REDACTED]	NO	MASTERS, GREG	SEP-05-2017 16:18	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	32	EMAIL	N/A	1	Visit to 10th District Station: attempt to locate video surveillance equipment.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	SEP-05-2017 16:18	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	33	LETTER TO COMPLAINANT	N/A	4	Email correspondence with complainant [REDACTED] regarding potential witness identification and correct mailing address.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	SEP-05-2017 16:20	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	34	REPORT - DETAIL OF PERSONNEL (PATROL)	N/A	2	Letter to [REDACTED] requesting cooperation and participation in the investigation. (Returned to sender)	YES	MASTERS, GREG	SEP-05-2017 16:21	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	35	REPORT (OTHER)	N/A	1	Personnel Suite / Office Automation Watch Screen: David, Andrew, Star 16316.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	SEP-07-2017 16:26	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	36	VIDEO RECORDING	N/A	1	Records Services Division Memo Re: Ipra Request for BWC and ICC video. Dated 18 July 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	SEP-07-2017 16:27	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	37	VIDEO RECORDING	N/A	1	Envelope containing CD with BWC video recording, PO David, Star 16316, 13 July 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	SEP-07-2017 16:30	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	38	REPORT - DETAIL OF PERSONNEL (PATROL)	N/A	1	Envelope containing CD with BWC video recording: PO Hernandez, Star 7917, 13 July 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	SEP-07-2017 16:32	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	39	ATTENDANCE AND ASSIGNMENT RECORD	N/A	4	Personnel Suite / Office Automation Watch Screen: Sgt. Thelma Vega, Star 1181. Printed October 25, 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	OCT-25-2017 10:08	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	40	ACCUSED NOTIFICATION OF ALLEGATIONS FOR VEGA, THELMA	ACCUSED - VEGA, THELMA	-	District 10, Third Watch Attendance & Assignment Sheet for July 13, 2017, Printed October 25, 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	OCT-25-2017 10:10	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	41	ACCUSED NOTIFICATION OF ALLEGATIONS FOR HERNANDEZ, MARCOS	ACCUSED - HERNANDEZ, MARCOS	-	MASTERS, GREG	OCT-26-2017 09:40	ACCUSED ACKNOWLEDGED ALLEGATIONS	OCT-26-2017 10:08	PENDING ACCUSED ACKNOWLEDGMENT	-	-
<a href="#">View</a>	42			-	MASTERS, GREG					-	-

	ACCUSED NOTIFICATION OF ALLEGATIONS FOR DAVID, ANDREW	ACCUSED - DAVID, ANDREW			OCT-26-2017 10:18	ACCUSED ACKNOWLEDGED ALLEGATIONS			
<a href="#">View</a> 43	REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW/STATEMENT/REPORT	ACCUSED - VEGA, THELMA	5	Request for interview, Sgt. Vega. Sent via fax and CPD mail on October 25, 2017. Copies of Notification of Allegations, Admin. Proceeding Rights, and Waiver of Counsel/Request to Secure Counsel, and FAX receipt attached.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	OCT-26-2017 10:31	APPROVED	- YES
<a href="#">View</a> 44	REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW/STATEMENT/REPORT	ACCUSED - HERNANDEZ, 6 MARCOS	6	Request for interview, Officer Hernandez. Sent via fax and CPD mail on October 25, 2017. Copies of Notification of Allegations, Admin. Proceeding Rights, and Waiver of Counsel/Request to Secure Counsel, and FAX receipt attached.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	OCT-26-2017 10:34	APPROVED	- YES
<a href="#">View</a> 45	REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW/STATEMENT/REPORT	ACCUSED - DAVID, ANDREW	5	Request for interview, Officer David. Sent via fax and CPD mail on October 25, 2017. Copies of Notification of Allegations, Admin. Proceeding Rights, and Waiver of Counsel/Request to Secure Counsel, and FAX receipt attached.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	OCT-26-2017 10:35	APPROVED	- YES
<a href="#">View</a> 46	REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW/STATEMENT/REPORT	ACCUSED - VEGA, THELMA	2	Request for interview sent to Sgt. Vega on November 3, 2017. Interview re-scheduled for November 14, 2017, at 1000, at the request of Sgt. Vega because her counsel was not available for the original date and time. Fax receipt also attached.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	NOV-03-2017 09:30	APPROVED	- YES
<a href="#">View</a> 47	REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW/STATEMENT/REPORT	ACCUSED - DAVID, ANDREW	3	Request for interview sent to PO David on November 3, 2017. Interview re-scheduled for November 13, 2017, at 1400, at the request of PO David because of scheduled SWAT training. Fax receipt also attached.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	NOV-03-2017 15:53	APPROVED	- YES
<a href="#">View</a> 48	NOTIFICATION OF CHARGES/ALLEGATIONS	ACCUSED - VEGA, THELMA	1	Notification of Charges/Allegations served on Sgt Vega by Lt. Hernandez #308, dated 2 November 2017, received through CPD mail by COPA on November 7, 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	NOV-08-2017 09:22	APPROVED	- YES
<a href="#">View</a> 49	ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS RIGHTS	ACCUSED - VEGA, THELMA	1	Administrative Proceeding Rights served on Sgt Vega by Lt. Hernandez #308, dated 2 November 2017, received through CPD mail by COPA on November 7, 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	NOV-08-2017 09:23	APPROVED	- YES
<a href="#">View</a> 50	WAIVER OF COUNSEL/REQUEST TO SECURE COUNSEL	ACCUSED - VEGA, THELMA	1	Waiver of Counsel/Request to Secure Counsel form served on Sgt Vega by Lt. Hernandez #308, dated 2 November 2017, received through CPD mail by COPA on November 7, 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	NOV-08-2017 09:24	APPROVED	- YES
<a href="#">View</a> 51	REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW/STATEMENT/REPORT	ACCUSED - HERNANDEZ, 2 MARCOS	2	Request for interview, Officer Hernandez, and fax receipt. Sent via fax and CPD mail on November 13, 2017. Date and time of interview changed at the request of PO Hernandez.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	NOV-13-2017 10:10	APPROVED	- YES
<a href="#">View</a> 52	DEPARTMENT DIRECTIVE OR GENERAL ORDER	N/A	16	Special Order S04-13-09, Investigatory Stop System, issued 10 July 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	NOV-13-2017 13:33	APPROVED	- YES
<a href="#">View</a> 53	DEPARTMENT DIRECTIVE OR GENERAL ORDER	N/A	4	General Order G08-01-02 Specific Responsibilities Regarding Allegations of Misconduct, Issued 11 March 2013.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	NOV-14-2017 16:48	APPROVED	- YES
<a href="#">View</a> 54	NOTIFICATION OF CHARGES/ALLEGATIONS	ACCUSED - DAVID, ANDREW	1	Notification of Charges/Allegations, P.O. David, 13 Nov 17, 1404 hours. Signed by P.O. David, witnessed by Inv.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	NOV-14-2017 16:55	APPROVED	- YES

<a href="#">View</a> 55	ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS RIGHTS	ACCUSED - DAVID, ANDREW	1	Masters #71 and Inv. Goodwin #64. Admin Proceeding Rights, P.O. David, 13 Nov 2017, 1404 hours, signed by P.O. David and witnessed by Inv. Masters #71 and Inv. Goodwin #64.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	NOV-14-2017 16:59	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 56	AUDIO INTERVIEW	ACCUSED - DAVID, ANDREW	1	Part 1: Digitally recorded interview of accused P.O. David, November 13, 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	NOV-14-2017 17:05	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 57	AUDIO INTERVIEW	ACCUSED - DAVID, ANDREW	1	Part 2: Digitally recorded interview of accused P.O. David, November 13, 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	NOV-14-2017 17:06	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 58	NOTIFICATION OF CHARGES/ALLEGATIONS	ACCUSED - VEGA, THELMA	1	Notification of Charges/Allegations, Sgt. Thelma Vega, signed by Sgt. Vega and witnessed by Inv. Masters #71 and Inv. Goodwin #64. November 14, 2017, 9:58 a.m.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	NOV-15-2017 09:13	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 59	ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS RIGHTS	ACCUSED - VEGA, THELMA	1	Administrative Proceeding Rights, signed by Sgt. Thelma Vega. November 14, 2017, 9:58 a.m. Witnessed by Inv. Masters #71 and Inv. Goodwin #64.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	NOV-15-2017 09:15	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 60	AUDIO INTERVIEW	ACCUSED - VEGA, THELMA	1	Part 1: Digitally recorded interview of accused Sgt. Thelma Vega, November 14, 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	NOV-15-2017 09:23	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 61	AUDIO INTERVIEW	ACCUSED - VEGA, THELMA	1	Part 2: Digitally recorded interview of accused Sgt. Thelma Vega, November 14, 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	NOV-15-2017 09:23	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 62	REPORT (OTHER)	N/A	1	Arrest Report Search Print, 13 July 2017, District 010 Lockup, generated by Sgt. Thelma Vega, PC0Y449.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	NOV-15-2017 09:25	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 63	NOTIFICATION OF CHARGES/ALLEGATIONS	ACCUSED - HERNANDEZ, 5 MARCOS	5	Revised Notification of Charges/Allegations and Waiver of Counsel/Request to Secure Counsel form, accused P.O. Marcos Hernandez, and fax receipt. Sent to District 010 via fax and CPD mail, November 14, 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	NOV-15-2017 09:33	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 64	NOTIFICATION OF CHARGES/ALLEGATIONS	ACCUSED - HERNANDEZ, 3 MARCOS	3	Notification of Allegations, Officer Marcos Hernandez, signed by PO Hernandez and witnessed by Inv. Masters and Inv. Goodwin on November 20, 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	NOV-20-2017 14:59	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 65	ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS RIGHTS	ACCUSED - HERNANDEZ, 1 MARCOS	1	Administrative Proceeding Rights, Officer Marcos Hernandez, signed by PO Hernandez and witnessed by Inv. Masters and Inv. Goodwin on November 20, 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	NOV-20-2017 14:59	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 66	AUDIO INTERVIEW	N/A	1	Part 1: Digitally recorded interview of accused P.O. Hernandez, November 20, 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	NOV-20-2017 15:01	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 67	AUDIO INTERVIEW	N/A	1	Part 2: Digitally recorded interview of accused P.O. Hernandez, November 20, 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	NOV-20-2017 15:05	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 68	REPORT - DETAIL OF PERSONNEL (PATROL)	N/A	1	CLEAR Personnel Suite / Office Automation Watch Screen, Sgt. Richard Salvador #964.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	NOV-20-2017 15:06	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 69	REPORT (OTHER)	N/A	2	Letter to [REDACTED] Service Request form for overtime records for Sgt. Salvador #964 for 13 July 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	NOV-24-2017 16:12	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 70	EMAIL	N/A	4	Email to [REDACTED] requesting video recording (s) from Smith's visit to the lobby of the District 010 station on July 13, 2017, and requesting an updated mailing address for [REDACTED]	YES	MASTERS, GREG	NOV-29-2017 16:05	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a> 71	ACCUSED NOTIFICATION OF ALLEGATIONS FOR SALVADOR, RICHARD	ACCUSED - SALVADOR, RICHARD	-		-	MASTERS, GREG	NOV-30-2017 13:57	ACCUSED ACKNOWLEDGED ALLEGATIONS	-	-
<a href="#">View</a> 72	REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW/STATEMENT/REPORT	N/A	5	Request for interview, Sergeant Salvador. Sent	YES	MASTERS, GREG	NOV-30-2017 13:57	APPROVED	-	YES

<a href="#">View</a>	73	REPORT (OTHER)	N/A	6	via fax and CPD mail on November 30, 2017. Copies of Notification of Allegations, Admin. Proceeding Rights, and Waiver of Counsel/Request to Secure Counsel, and FAX receipt attached.	NO	MASTERS, GREG	NOV-30-2017 15:10	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	74	REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW/STATEMENT/REPORT	N/A	2	Time & Attendance Record and Overtime/Compensatory Time Report, Sgt. Richard Salvador, 13 July 2017. Request for Interview, Sgt. Richard Salvador #964, sent via CPD Mail and FAX to District 010 on December 12, 2017. At the request of Sgt. Salvador, this interview has been rescheduled from December 19, 2017, to December 28, 2017, due to Sgt. Salvador's counsel's scheduling conflict. FAX receipt also attached.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	DEC-12-2017 12:28	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	75	DEPARTMENT DIRECTIVE OR GENERAL ORDER	N/A	10	Special Order S03-14 "Body Worn Cameras" issued and effective on 09 June 2017.	NO	MASTERS, GREG	DEC-28-2017 14:45	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	76	NOTIFICATION OF CHARGES/ALLEGATIONS	ACCUSED - SALVADOR, RICHARD	1	Notification of Charges/Allegations signed by Sgt. Salvador #964 and witnessed by Inv. Masters and Inv. Goodwin on December 28, 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JAN-02-2018 10:22	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	77	ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS RIGHTS	ACCUSED - SALVADOR, RICHARD	1	Admin. Proceeding Rights form signed by Sgt. Salvador #964 and witnessed by Inv. Masters and Inv. Goodwin on December 28, 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JAN-02-2018 10:23	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	78	AUDIO INTERVIEW	ACCUSED - SALVADOR, RICHARD	1	Recorded statement of accused Sgt. Salvador #964 taken by Inv. Masters and Inv. Goodwin on December 28, 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JAN-02-2018 10:27	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	79	COMPLAINANT STATEMENT	N/A	40	Transcribed statement of complainant [REDACTED] July 14, 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JAN-09-2018 06:50	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	80	STATEMENT OF POLICE OFFICER	N/A	36	Part I: Transcribed statement of accused Sgt. Thelma Vega. November 14, 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JAN-09-2018 06:51	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	81	STATEMENT OF POLICE OFFICER	N/A	12	Part II: Transcribed statement of accused Sgt. Thelma Vega. November 14, 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JAN-09-2018 06:52	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	82	STATEMENT OF POLICE OFFICER	N/A	42	Part I: Transcribed statement of accused PO Andrew David. November 13, 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JAN-09-2018 06:53	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	83	STATEMENT OF POLICE OFFICER	N/A	30	Part II: Transcribed statement of accused PO Andrew David. November 13, 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JAN-09-2018 06:54	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	84	STATEMENT OF POLICE OFFICER	N/A	52	Part I: Transcribed statement of accused PO Marcos Hernandez. November 20, 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JAN-09-2018 07:15	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	85	STATEMENT OF POLICE OFFICER	N/A	34	Part II: Transcribed statement of accused PO Marcos Hernandez. November 20, 2017.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JAN-09-2018 07:16	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	86	STATEMENT OF POLICE OFFICER	ACCUSED - SALVADOR, RICHARD	30	Transcribed statement of accused Sgt. Richard Salvador #964.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JAN-22-2018 12:54	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	87	INVESTIGATOR CASE LOG	N/A	5	-	YES	MASTERS, GREG	JAN-31-2018 09:16	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	88	SUMMARY REPORT	N/A	38	Disciplinary recommendations for Officer David, Officer Hernandez, and Sgt. Salvador, and summary of 7-year disciplinary history for Sgt. Salvador.	YES	MASTERS, GREG	MAR-23-2018 15:28	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	89	DISCIPLINARY HISTORY	N/A	11	Settlement Agreement - MLAS	NO	MASTERS, GREG	MAR-26-2018 09:53	APPROVED	-	YES
<a href="#">View</a>	-	REPORT (OTHER)	N/A	12	Settlement Agreement - MLAS	-	DOMAIN, ALEXANDRA	MAR-22-2019 08:53	APPROVED	-	YES

<a href="#">View</a>	-	REPORT (OTHER)	N/A	14	Binding Summary Opinion	-	CLOYD, WENDY	FEB-01- 2019 09:34	APPROVED	-	YES
----------------------	---	----------------	-----	----	-------------------------	---	-----------------	--------------------------	----------	---	-----

row(s) 1 - 91 of 91

**Internal Use Only**

No Internal Use Only attachments available.

**Print Accused Appeal Forms**

No Accused Appeal forms available for this Log No.

**Related Incidents** TIP Related Incidents listed below are for reference only. These may be viewed using the related application search screens.

No Related Incidents associated with this Log No.

**Status History** TIP Every employee included in the Status History is subject to be called for legal or administrative proceedings.

Resulting Status	Status Date/Time	Created By	Position	Employee No.	Assigned/ Detailed Unit	Comments
PENDING ACCUSED APPEAL	05-JUN-2018 16:22	DOMAIN, ALEXANDRA	SUPERVISOR PARALEGAL		113 / -	-
PENDING REVIEW AFTER SUPERINTENDENT DECISION	25-MAY-2018 11:00	BOIK, ROBERT	SUPT'S CHIEF OF STAFF		111 / -	-
PENDING REVIEW AFTER SUPERINTENDENT DECISION	25-MAY-2018 11:00	BOIK, ROBERT	SUPT'S CHIEF OF STAFF		111 / -	-
PENDING REVIEW AFTER SUPERINTENDENT DECISION	25-MAY-2018 11:00	BOIK, ROBERT	SUPT'S CHIEF OF STAFF		111 / -	-
PENDING SUPERINTENDENT DECISION	15-MAY-2018 09:40	CONNOLLY, LUKE	SERGEANT OF POLICE		121 / -	-
PENDING ACCUSED APPEAL	15-MAY-2018 09:23	CONNOLLY, LUKE	SERGEANT OF POLICE		121 / -	-
PENDING ADVOCATE REVIEW	15-MAY-2018 09:18	CONNOLLY, LUKE	SERGEANT OF POLICE		121 / -	-
PENDING REVIEW INCIDENT (I.A.D./DISTRICT USE)	15-MAY-2018 09:16	CONNOLLY, LUKE	SERGEANT OF POLICE		121 / -	-
PENDING SUPERINTENDENT DECISION	15-MAY-2018 09:14	CONNOLLY, LUKE	SERGEANT OF POLICE		121 / -	-
PENDING ADVOCATE REVIEW	15-MAY-2018 09:13	CONNOLLY, LUKE	SERGEANT OF POLICE		121 / -	-
PENDING REVIEW INCIDENT (I.A.D./DISTRICT USE)	15-MAY-2018 08:59	CONNOLLY, LUKE	SERGEANT OF POLICE		121 / -	Clear up CCR
PENDING SUPERINTENDENT DECISION	10-MAY-2018 15:19	COSTELLO, ROBERT	SERGEANT OF POLICE		121 / -	-
PENDING COMMAND CHANNEL REVIEW	04-MAY-2018 08:20	RYAN, KEVIN	DEP CHIEF		211 / -	-
PENDING COMMAND CHANNEL REVIEW	17-APR-2018 08:40	COSTELLO, ROBERT	SERGEANT OF POLICE		121 / -	-
PENDING ADVOCATE REVIEW	17-APR-2018 08:40	COSTELLO, ROBERT	SERGEANT OF POLICE		121 / -	-
PENDING REVIEW INCIDENT (I.A.D./DISTRICT USE)	17-APR-2018 08:36	COSTELLO, ROBERT	SERGEANT OF POLICE		121 / -	-
PENDING COMMAND CHANNEL REVIEW	17-APR-2018 08:35	COSTELLO, ROBERT	SERGEANT OF POLICE		121 / -	-
PENDING COMMAND CHANNEL REVIEW	05-APR-2018 17:04	HOLT, ELGIN	COMMANDER		212 / -	-
PENDING COMMAND CHANNEL REVIEW	28-MAR-2018 08:53	COSTELLO, ROBERT	SERGEANT OF POLICE		121 / -	-
PENDING ADVOCATE REVIEW	27-MAR-2018 15:18	OLIVER, MELVIN	POLICE OFFICER		007 / 121	-
PENDING REVIEW INCIDENT (I.A.D./DISTRICT USE)	27-MAR-2018 10:23	DOMAIN, ALEXANDRA	CLERK 3		113 / -	-
CLOSED AT C.O.P.A.	27-MAR-2018 09:58	DOMAIN, ALEXANDRA	CLERK 3		113 / -	-
PENDING REVIEW INCIDENT (C.O.P.A. USE ONLY)	26-MAR-2018 18:19	KERSTEN, ANDREA	DEPUTY CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR		113 / -	-
PENDING INVESTIGATION	19-MAR-2018 16:28	HAYNAM, MATTHEW	SUPERVISING INV COPA		113 / -	-
PENDING ASSIGN INVESTIGATOR	08-FEB-2018 18:01	WESTENSEE, JAY	DEPUTY CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR		113 / -	-
PENDING INVESTIGATION	08-FEB-2018 18:01	WESTENSEE, JAY	DEPUTY CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR		113 / -	-
PENDING INVESTIGATIVE REVIEW	31-JAN-2018 10:03	MASTERS, GREG	INVESTIGATOR 3 COPA		113 / -	-
PENDING INVESTIGATION	21-JUL-2017 16:38	CLARK, MARK	SUPERVISING INV COPA		113 / -	-
PENDING ASSIGN INVESTIGATOR	20-JUL-2017 15:34	PFEIFER, ADAM	SUPERVISING INV COPA		113 / -	Type Changed from INFO to CR on 20-JUL-2017 15:34 by PFEIFER, ADAM Affidavit information for this Log Number has changed on 20-JUL-2017 15:34 by PFEIFER, ADAM
PENDING ASSIGN TEAM	14-JUL-2017 16:58	PFEIFER, ADAM	SUPERVISING INV COPA		113 / -	-
PENDING SUPERVISOR REVIEW	14-JUL-2017 15:09	STEWART, DENISE	INTAKE AIDE		113 / -	-
PRELIMINARY	14-JUL-2017 14:19	STEWART, DENISE	INTAKE AIDE		113 / -	-

row(s) 1 - 32 of 32

**Command Channel Reviewers**

Accused Name	Sequence No.	Reviewer
VEGA, THELMA	1	RYAN, KEVIN
VEGA, THELMA	2	WALLER, FRED
DAVID, ANDREW	1	RYAN, KEVIN
HERNANDEZ, MARCOS	1	RYAN, KEVIN

row(s) 1 - 4 of 4

User: [REDACTED]  
Module: 15280 \$Revision: 1.252 \$

Copyright © 2002, All rights reserved.